DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 998 HE 013 210

TITLE Faculty Career Development. Current Issues in Higher Education No. 2, 1979.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 44p.: Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Adult Development; Career Development; *Career Ladders; College Administration; *College Faculty; College Instruction; College Role; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Individual Needs; Job Satisfaction; Noninstructional Responsibility; Occupational Mobility; Productivity; Promotion (Occupational); Publications; Research Opportunities; Research Projects; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Responsibility; *Teaching (Occupation); Work Environment

ABSTRACT

Issues pertinent to faculty development are considered in six papers. In "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument," Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. provides background information on the teaching, research, and other professional activities of college faculty, based on his research. In "Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty?" Roger Baldwin outlines faculty career stages and discusses the challenges each stage provides and the responses each elicits. In "Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research," B. Claude Mathis identifies four functional stages of the faculty career where intervention on the part of the institution can foster personal growth and career development. In "Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities," Robert T. Blackburn outlines factors affecting faculty productivity, concluding that it could be increased significantly through a combination of administrative action and a "free-wheeling," supportive work environment. In "Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview," Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin advocate increased institutional efforts to help junior faculty direct their career paths. In "Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning Under Changing Conditions," Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Selder, and Nina Verroca describe the growth contract, which attempts to mesh individual plans and institutional goals by encouraging individual efforts that respond to institutional needs. (SW)

Current Issues

In Higher Education

1979

ED193998

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

(2) FACULTY CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.
Roger Baldwin
B. Claude Mathis
Robert T. Blackburn
Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin
Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Solder, and
Nina Verroca

HE 013 210

American Association for Higher Education

The American Association for Higher Education

The American Association for Higher Education is a national association open to all individuals concerned about the value and effectiveness of higher education. Each year AAHE's National Conference on Higher Education brings together approximately 2,500 educational administrators, faculty, students, government and foundation officials, representatives from accrediting and testing agencies, and others, to clarify issues, disseminate effective educational practices, and discuss the future of higher education.

The theme of the 1979 National Conference was "The Academic Workforce: Opportunities for Renewal." Some of the papers prepared for presentation at the conference were selected by a review committee for publication in the annual conference series, *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Many of the papers in this series focus on the quality of worklife in academe and ways to improve it. In some cases, the papers have been revised by their authors and therefore differ somewhat from the actual conference presentation. They have not, however, been extensively edited or revised, since the purpose of the series is to disseminate the conference presentations as rapidly as possible. Points of view and opinions reflected in this series are those of the authors, not the Association.

AAHE Members:

Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979 *will be sent to you weekly during September and October. The seven monographs that you will receive are listed inside the back cover.*

Board of Directors, 1979-1980

President

Martin Kramer, Senior Fellow, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education

Vice President (President-Elect)

Martha E. Church, President, Hood College

Immediate Past President

Wilbert J. McKeachie, Director, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, The University of Michigan

Members

Alexander W. Astin, Professor of Higher Education, University of California-Los Angeles, and President, Higher Education Research Institute

Marie Childers, Graduate Student, Department of Higher Education, Indiana University

Morton Darrow, Vice President, Planning and Analysis, The Prudential Insurance Company of America

Paul A. Elsner, Chancellor, Maricopa County Community College District

Sister Collette Mahoney, President, Marymount Manhattan College

Arturo Madrid, Associate Dean and Executive Officer, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota

Robert F. Sexton, Executive Director, Office for Experiential Education, University of Kentucky

Donald Stewart, President, Spelman College

Elizabeth Wells, Consultant, Cincinnati, Ohio

Willard Wirtz, Chairman of the Board, National Manpower Institute

Published seven times a year during September and October. Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at Washington, DC.

Subscriptions: Subscriptions are $12.50 for the *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979* series. Nine dollars of the AAHE membership fee covers subscription costs for *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Ordering information and prices for individual monographs are provided inside the back cover.

Copyright 1979, American Association for Higher Education.

Faculty Development

Introduction 2

The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument 3
By Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty? 13
By Roger Baldwin

Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research 21
By B. Claude Mathis

Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities 25
By Robert T. Blackburn

Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview 29
By Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin

Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning Under Changing Conditions? 33
By Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Solder, and Nina Verroca

Published by the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036

Introduction

Less faculty turnover in higher education calls for greater attention to and understanding of existing human resources. With that in mind, the six papers in this monograph review what is known about faculty productivity, attitudes, satisfactions, and career growth and decline periods. Institutional strategies that could be used to support faculty as they progress through their careers are described. The underlying question is, How can individual and institution work together for mutual, complementary growth?

- Everett Carll Ladd's research provides background information on the teaching, research, and other professional activities of faculty. His interpretations of the data focus on the fit between what faculty do, what they want to do, and what they should do or are required to do by their employers.
- Roger Baldwin outlines faculty career stages and discusses the challenges each stage provides and the responses each elicits. Information about characteristic experiences and needs at various career stages, he says, could help administrators and faculty groups capitalize on faculty assets.
- B. Claude Mathis identifies four functional stages of the faculty career where intervention on the part of the institution can foster personal growth and career development. He discusses ways that institutions can make career management a goal that is supported and encouraged for faculty.
- Robert Blackburn outlines factors affecting faculty productivity, concluding that it could be increased significantly through a combination of administrative action and a "free-wheeling," supportive work environment. He provides an extensive list of resources documenting the subject.
- Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin call for increased institutional efforts to help junior faculty direct their career paths. They discuss cooperative efforts that have been successful in helping faculty negotiate the political and social hurdles of the academic profession.
- Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Solder, and Nina Verroca describe a renewal strategy—the growth contract. It attempts to mesh individual plans and institutional goals by encouraging individual efforts that respond to institutional needs. They discuss attitudes toward the growth contract on the part of academic planners and point out the applicability of such contracts by institutional type.

Although the concerns and suggestions brought forward in this monograph vary, it is clear that all of the authors would recognize the increasing interdependence of faculty and their employer institutions.

The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument

By Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

This paper has two parts—not unrelated but distinct. In the first I draw upon survey data, with which I have been working over the past decade, to provide some straightforward, factual description of the professional activities, commitments, and concerns of academics. In the second, I try to account for that facet of the work experience of faculty that I find the most disturbing and the most threatening to the health of higher education—the ascendancy of a norm or standard of appropriate professional conduct that emphasizes the importance of "research." My argument here draws upon data presented in the first section, but as will be apparent it involves a number of bold leaps beyond the bounds of the formal survey information. Stated another way, the second part of this paper advances some hypotheses that bear upon an important dimension of the professional life of faculty; while these hypotheses are informed by the available survey data, they cannot be confirmed (or rejected) on the basis of these data.

Most academics think of themselves as "teachers" and "professionals," not as "scholars," "scientists," or "intellectuals"—and they perform accordingly.

I. The Worklife of American Professors

I am hardly the first to take issue with the popular assumption that academics are a body of scholars—men and women who do their research and then report their findings to the intellectual or scientific communities. Some faculty, of course, behave in just this fashion. But as a description of the profession, the assumption is seriously flawed. Most academics think of themselves as "teachers" and "professionals," not as "scholars," "scientists," or "intellectuals"—and they perform accordingly.

Scholarship

As data on the number of articles in professional journals and the number of academic books published yearly testify, faculty are producing a prodigious volume of printed words. But this torrent is gushing forth from relatively few pens. Nearly three-fifths of all those employed fulltime in professorial positions have never brought to publication any sort of book written or edited singularly or in collaboration with others.[1]

In all, just under one-fourth of American professors have published extensively—which for the sake of statistical representation, I have construed as twenty or more articles and/or three or more monographs. Over half have published nothing or very little. Young academics have, of course, not had the opportunity to accumulate as many career publications as their more senior colleagues, but the rate of *current* publications is somewhat higher for academics in their first two professorial decades (25 years of age to 44) than it is thereafter (Tables 3 and 5). To no one's surprise, the various surveys show massive variations in the simple rates of publication by type of institution. Thus, 87 percent of the faculty (according to the 1977 Ladd-Lipset Survey) at two-year colleges have published nothing or very little in their careers, as compared to just 28 percent of those at the major research universities. But even at the latter institutions—those emphasizing research and those best equipped in terms of facilities to promote it—large numbers of faculty do not publish extensively (Tables 2 and 4).

The reader might ask whether I haven't been dwelling too much on numbers. Isn't it possible for Professor X to labor his whole career on one book, and thereby build a monument to scholarship, while Professor Y produces one hundred articles not worth the sacrifice of a single tree? Of course. The type of survey data with which I am working here captures numbers, not quality. I would still insist that the publication of articles, books, and monographs is the primary mode of scholarly exchange in most disciplines, and that it is meaningful to note that large numbers of faculty rarely if ever engage in this exchange. And while one can easily cite individual exceptions, it is probably true for the professoriate as a whole that major research contributions are rarely associated with those who publish only two or three items over the course of a career. One cannot equate publishing heavily with making a major research contribution, but one can

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. is a Professor of Political Science and Director of the Social Science Data Center at the University of Connecticut-Storrs. He is also Co-Executive Director of the Roper Center.

[1] In discussing the publications and other professional activities of academics, I will for reasons of stylistic comfort write as though the data on which I am relying were collected in the spring of 1979. In fact, the survey that I will be regularly citing was conducted in the *spring of 1977*, under my direction and that of Seymour Martin Lipset. Unless otherwise specifically indicated, all of the data come from the 1977 Ladd-Lipset study. There is no reason to believe that in publications or other similar facets of the work experience the faculty has changed very much over the last two years. Still, I again remind the reader that I use the present tense for stylistic ease, and the data are in fact two years old. (Footnote continued on next page.)

probably equate publishing very little or not at all with an insubstantial research contribution—as a general rule.[2]

Teaching

American academics have often been criticized for not spending much time with their students, for fleeing the classroom for their research and writing. While there is surely some basis for this charge, we know that the majority of the faculty members are very actively engaged in teaching. The 1977 Survey showed 47 percent of professors spending ten or more hours per week "in formal instruction in class": 30 percent taught thirteen or more hours a week, and only 17 percent had four weekly hours or less of classroom contact. Substantial to heavy teaching loads (nine hours or up) are the rule everywhere outside the research universities (Table 6).

Professors report fairly standard workweeks, in terms of numbers of hours devoted to professional activities. While 18 percent indicate that they work 55 hours or more in an average week, 13 percent state that they put in less than 30 hours (with this proportion rising to 33 percent of those at two-year colleges). The mean work week which all faculty report is 44 hours and the median number of hours spent in professional activities in a typical week is 43 hours (Table 7). For most faculty, teaching is the big claimant of time. The median number of hours put into research and scholarly writing is *four,* compared to something in the 9-to-16-hour range for both scheduled teaching and preparing for teaching. Everywhere outside the research universities teaching-related activities dwarf those related to scholarship.[3]

Preferences

Academics as a group spend a fairly modest amount of their time in research and scholarship, much of it in teaching. And they prefer it that way. Only 7 percent indicate that their interests lie heavily in research. Another 23 percent express an interest in both teaching and research, but with a "leaning" toward the latter. For the remaining 70 percent of academics, the personal preference is for teaching. For every one professor strongly devoted to research pursuits, there are five others heavily committed to teaching. These proportions have remained fairly constant over the last decade (Table 9).

The younger the faculty member, the more likely he or she is to have interests heavily or significantly in research. And the most research-committed group of all, by far, are young faculty at research universities. Even at those institutions, which are by far the most research emphasizing, a majority of faculty 45 years of age and older state that they are more interested in teaching than in research (Table 10).

Respondents to the 1975 and the 1977 Ladd-Lipset surveys were asked to indicate which among a series of categories best identified their academic roles. The terms fitted into two larger groupings. "Scholar," "scientist," and "intellectual" all speak to a primary involvement in the research enterprise. "Professional" and "teacher," on the other hand, suggest a concentration in the classroom or in administration, in communicating knowledge rather than developing new knowledge. Seventy percent of all academics—with a proportion ranging from 93 percent at two-year colleges to 50 percent at research universities—think of themselves as teachers or as professionals (Table 11).

There is, on the surface, a fairly good fit between what faculty want to do—as teachers and researchers—and what they are required to do. For example, those who say their personal preferences are heavily for research have very light teaching loads—the median is four hours per week—while those who are principally interested in teaching get the chance to teach a lot, with the median at twelve hours a week. I do not overlook the possibility of some benign deception—professors who must teach a lot have been known to say they really prefer teaching. And there is that fraction of one percent of the professoriate who are strongly committed to research but are required to teach 21 or more hours each week. On the whole, the fit is, superficially, a good one. Later in this paper I will argue that, in a very different sense, the fit between interests and stipulated behavior is very bad.

Dissatisfactions

By all of the measures we have reviewed, American

[1](cont'd)

On occasion, I will cite information from the faculty survey conducted in 1975 under the auspices of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. I have also drawn on the 1975 Ladd-Lipset Faculty Survey and on the survey administered in 1969 for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. On the whole, these four studies present a notably consistent picture of the work experience of American academics.

- 1969—Carnegie Commission survey of faculty. 60,028 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available without restriction from several disseminating organizations, including The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut.
- 1975—Faculty survey conducted under the direction of Everett Ladd and Martin Lipset. 3,536 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available without restriction from The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut.
- 1975—Carnegie Council survey of faculty. 25,262 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available with certain restrictions from The Survey Research Center, University of California at Berkeley.
- 1977—Faculty survey conducted under the direction of Everett Ladd and Martin Lipset. 4,383 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. To become available without restriction in the summer of 1979 from The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut.

[2]Note: Outside the natural sciences, those who write a large number of articles and those who publish many books are, with few exceptions, the same people. The pattern is very different in the natural science disciplines, where journal articles are the normal form of scholarship.

[3] The students who occupy these hours of faculty time are, disproportionately, undergraduates. Only 13 percent of all professors indicate that graduate students in doctoral-level programs are their "primary teaching responsibility"; the proportion is 37 percent among faculty at research universities. Some 73 percent of academics indicate that undergraduates are the primary group with whom they work (Table 8).

academics constitute a teaching profession. Yet it is a teaching profession that is very dissatisfied. We hear a lot these days about the economic troubles which beset higher education in this age of little economic growth and high inflation. Faculty salaries are losing ground to inflation and to the salary performance of other occupations.[4] But faculty dissatisfactions are by no means strictly economic. There is the strong sense that the teaching enterprise is not going well, and for reasons quite removed from dollars and cents.

Table 12 shows something of the range of faculty criticism of the teaching activity in higher education. Seventy-two percent argue that too many people ill-suited for academic life are now enrolling in colleges and universities. Ninety-six percent maintain that the students with whom they have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills, such as those required for written and oral communication. The argument that there has been a widespread lowering of standards in American higher education is accepted by 81 percent of all professors. That grade inflation is a serious academic standards problem "at my institution" is agreed to in whole or in part by all but 4 percent of academics. And faculty are not simply inclined to point the finger of criticism at their colleagues. Sixty-nine percent of them agree that "I find myself not grading as 'hard,' not applying as high standards in assessing student work, as I believe I should." We find a malaise, then, extending all across faculty assessments of the quality of the teaching activity. And the complaints are by no means confined to one sector of academe. They are offered as much by professors at research universities as by those at two-year colleges, as much by young as by senior professors (Table 12).

II. The Tyranny of the Research Model

Most college and university professors in the United States do not think of themselves as research people. Their interests lie primarily in teaching. They spend most of their time in teaching-related activities. And a clear majority of faculty have published little or nothing. None of these conditions, by themselves, present any cause for concern. With more than ten million students enrolled in institutions of higher education, there is more than enough work to be done by the majority, whose preferences and performance cast academe as a teaching profession.

Still, there is a problem—at least as I see it and, it appears, in the judgment of many observers of the performance of American higher education. This problem arises from the clear ascendancy within the teaching profession of a norm or model which emphasizes the importance of research. Where does this research model hold sway? First and foremost, the strength of its claim can be seen in the value structures of people associated with higher education. Whether or not they themselves do research or want to engage in original scholarship, most faculty seem to believe that the most meritorious behavior of an academic man or woman is the performance of significant research.

I advance this conclusion about faculty believing that research is really the highest calling on the basis of hundreds of informal conversations with professors and administrators in institutions of higher learning across the country—and *not* on the basis of any systematic survey data. The Carnegie surveys and those which Martin Lipset and I directed really do not provide any firm information on this subject.

When a particular norm is ascendant within a group and is institutionalized in various ways, it is very hard for a member of the group to deny its claim, even if intellectually he is fully convinced of its serious deficiency. I grew up in a town where performing ably for the high school football team was deemed the highest accomplishment to which a teenage male could aspire. I had no ability in football and no personal interest in participating in it; still, it was very hard indeed for me to deny the norm that athletic prowess was especially meritorious. Probably every reader of this paper has had some such experience. It is hardly necessary that a norm rest comfortably with the preferences and performance of most members of a group for it to compel their attention and to influence seriously their behavior.

My personal observations, supported in part by our survey data, are that most faculty don't like research and don't do it very well, if at all. It may be that research, properly construed—meaning scholarly activity aimed at the creation of new ideas, new knowledge, new art forms, and the like—makes demands and requires skills such as to permanently restrict participation in it to a distinct minority of faculty.

Many professors whom I encounter seem troubled by their failure to do significant research, for various reasons. They may encounter university pressures or peer criticisms. They may believe that in the absence of a "track record" of research accomplishments they are "trapped" at the institution where they now teach or are in grave peril of losing a "teaching" job altogether. Some are troubled by the fact that, despite the continuing stream of rhetoric about the importance of good teaching, the concrete rewards for it are typically very weak. In many cases it seems that the faculty members themselves, however much they prefer teaching, find it hard to resist the notion that research really is a higher calling.

An ascendant model in academe, positing what faculty *should be doing*, is seriously out of touch with what they *actually do* and *want to do*. The model is also profoundly at odds with the primary goal of promoting the best possible teaching—that is, the best educational experience—in the nation's colleges and universities.

We have seen that a majority of faculty believe that the educational enterprise is performing poorly. Students lack basic skills, appropriate academic standards are being allowed to deteriorate, and so on. Although I cannot

[4] The "Report on the Annual Survey of Faculty Compensation, 1977-78," published in the September 1978 *AAUP Bulletin* (pp.193-210), shows the average rate of compensation (including fringe benefits) declining yearly since the 1972-73 academic year, when one controls for inflation. The rates of decline for each academic year from the previous year are reported to be 1.5 percent in 1973-74, 4.2 percent in 1974-75, 0.7 percent in 1975-76, 0.3 percent in 1976-77, and 1.1 percent in the 1977-78 academic year. These data were collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics and prepared by Committee Z of the American Association of University Professors.

prove it, I think that there is a strong connection between such teaching-related dissatisfactions and the ascendancy of the research model. So do large numbers of faculty and administrators with whom I have spoken. They believe that their colleges and universities are not educating students as well as they should or could, and that the emphasis placed on the importance of research is a culprit.

We have long heard it said, in defense of the research model, that "no one can be a good teacher unless he does research." This is nonsense, except in the case of advanced doctoral students, the "teaching" of whom often involves a kind of research apprenticeship with an active scholar. It is true that effective teaching requires careful preparation and that this preparation often involves something more than reading the textbook before the students read it. I would argue, looking to my own field, that no one can do an outstanding job of teaching advanced undergraduates in a course on public opinion unless he or she has worked with survey data. It is necessary to "get one's hands dirty" in the data. But this "hands-on" work with opinion data surely need not be research—the pursuit of new knowledge to be presented to one's peers. It can be a form of *preparation for teaching* where one actually conducts experiments using the data in order to understand them better and present them effectively to students.

Surely it is not true that no one can be a good college teacher unless he does research. It is also not true, but it is closer to being valid, that no one can be a good teacher *if he is* actively involved in research. Teaching is a vocation. To be done well, it requires not only the expenditure of large amounts of time, but the psychological commitment that it is vitally important and worthy of one's best efforts. It requires real ego involvement. And it is very hard to serve two masters—hard to be both committed to excellence of teaching and high achievement in research. Many faculty and administrators (I am tempted to say a growing number, on the basis of conversations that I have had over the past two years) believe that the caliber of undergraduate teaching is suffering because of the psychological emphasis, if not the number of hours spent, on demonstrating some research proficiency and attainment. One can hardly think of a neater prescription for malperformance than the nurturing of claims by professors of a research model—even though the majority of them prefer teaching and are required by the daily demands of their jobs to concentrate on teaching—all of which combine to produce a diminished commitment to quality teaching and the substantial production of inferior research.

It is not hard to see how it came to pass that the research model took hold. Contemporary American society does require and can support extensive and diverse research activity. Given the way we have organized things, teaching and research are conducted side by side in the same institution. Research has many attractions. It offers, for example, the opportunity to get one's name in print and acquire national recognition. It can be codified and reduced and entered on vitae in such a fashion that it can be assessed by one's peers at other institutions fairly and easily. Research activity, then, can create a situation in which the *profession* replaces the *institution* (college or university) as the primary evaluator of academic performance. And this is the situation that has developed in the United States in the years since World War II. It continues to hold sway because most graduate students are thoroughly indoctrinated in the research model and they carry its values with them as they move out to positions in colleges and universities of all types around the country.

Of course, there really is a need for good research in the nation's colleges and universities. My point is not that too much research is being done, but rather that it is foolish, even pernicious, to insist that the same people perform at high levels in both research and teaching.

The intellectual health of both academics and academe will be improved if there are renewed and ultimately successful efforts to give recognition to the training of students in what is primarily a teaching profession.

The reward structures for good research seem reasonably sturdy. We need to rebuild rewards for good teaching. We need to provide much more in the way of financial support for teaching preparation—even those elaborate forms of teaching preparation that some people would call research. We need to find far better ways—hard as that might be—to encourage faculty to engage themselves in quality teaching, while at the same time encouraging some of their colleagues at the same institutions to emphasize research. This sort of "pluralism" will not be attained unless large numbers of faculty and administrators become convinced of its importance and then elaborate the specific mechanisms required to implement it.

The "teaching vs. research" argument is hardly a new one. It has occupied the attention of faculty and administrators in the past and has inspired numerous experiments to redress perceived imbalances. My argument is nothing more than that these efforts have largely failed and that today the teaching profession is tyrannized by a research model. The intellectual health of both academics and academe will be improved if there are renewed and ultimately successful efforts to give recognition to the training of students in what is primarily a teaching profession.

Table 1. Publication History of American Academics
(Grand Total Percentages)

	Articles published							
Books Published	**None**	**1–2**	**3–4**	**5–10**	**11–20**	**21–30**	**31–50**	**More than 50**
None	24.4%	11.3%	6.9%	7.8%	4.2%	1.7%	1.4%	1.0%
1–2	4.0	6.4	3.9	5.6	3.4	1.4	0.8	1.0
3–4	0.5	1.6	0.7	2.0	1.2	0.8	0.5	1.0
5–10	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
More than 10	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset.

Table 1A. Publication History of American Academics
(Grand Total Percentages)*

	Articles Published							
Books Published	**None**	**1–2**	**3–4**	**5–10**	**11–20**	**21–30**	**31–50**	**More than 50**
None	24.4% **a**	11.3% **b**	6.9%	7.8%	4.2%	1.7%	1.4%	1.0%
1–2	4.0% **c**	6.4	3.9	5.6 **d**	3.4	1.4	0.8	1.0
3–4	0.5	1.6	0.7	2.0	1.2	0.8 **f**	0.5	1.0
5–10	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
More than 10	0.4 **e**	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1 **g**	0.2	0.9

Cells a–g represent the following:
a – None
b – Almost none
c – Light
d – Moderate
e – Heavy (Books only)
f – Heavy (Articles only)
g – Heavy (Both Books and Articles)
*Each figure above represents the percentage of the total sample who meet both the criteria for the "Books published" category and the "Articles published" category. For example, the first figure (24.4%) is the percentage of all respondents to these two questions who have not published any books or articles. Grand total of cell population – 100%.

Source: 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 2. Career Publication by Type of School**
(Column Percentages)

Amount of publications:	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-year Colleges
None	24%	7%	13%	25%	39%	51%
Almost none	18	12	18	24	23	16
Light	14	9	14	16	10	20
Moderate	21	32	28	18	24	5
Heavy (Books only)	10	10	12	11	3	8
Heavy (Articles only)	10	24	11	4	2	*
Heavy (Both Books and Articles)	3	6	4	2	0	0

*Less than 1%.
**Schools have been classified according to the gradient developed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (1973).

Source: The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 3. Career Publication by Age
(Column Percentages)

Amount of publications:	ALL FACULTY	Under 35 years of age	35–44 years	45–54 years	55 and older
None	24%	28%	26%	25%	17%
Almost none	18	24	16	19	10
Light	14	20	13	11	18
Moderate	21	21	27	19	14
Heavy (Books only)	10	5	7	12	18
Heavy (Articles only)	10	2	11	11	17
Heavy (Both Books and Articles)	3	0	1	4	7

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 4. Publications Last Two Years by Type of School
(Column Percentages)

Amount of publications*	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-year Colleges
None	43%	18%	32%	46%	57%	85%
Light	26	29	30	28	31	11
Moderate	18	25	24	16	10	4
Heavy	13	27	14	10	3	0

*The figures above represent, for each type of school and for all faculty, the percentages of respondents who have had, during the two-year period prior to this survey, the following amount of books and articles published or accepted for publication: "None" (no books or articles); "light" (no books and 1, 2, or 3 articles); "moderate" (no books and 4 or 5 articles, or 1 book and not more than 5 articles); "heavy" (2 or more books or at least 6 articles).

Source: The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd and S. M. Lipset.

Table 5. Publications Last Two Years by Age
(Column Percentages)

Amount of publication:	ALL FACULTY	Under 35 years of age	35–44 years	45–54 years	55 and older
None	43%	38%	36%	50%	55%
Light	26	31	29	22	20
Moderate	18	18	20	19	11
Heavy	13	14	15	10	15

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 6. Hours Spent in an Average Week on Professional Activities
(Column Percentages)

Hours spent in an average week on. . .	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral-Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-Year Colleges
Scheduled teaching						
None	3%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%
1–4	11	23	14	5	2	4
5–8	21	39	28	15	15	6
9–16	55	29	51	65	74	68
17–34	10	4	5	11	8	18
35+	1	1	*	2	0	0
Preparing for teaching						
None	3	4	2	3	0	5
1–4	12	18	11	12	8	7
5–8	28	29	27	24	19	36
9–16	37	34	36	39	30	39
17–34	18	14	22	18	41	10
35+	3	2	2	4	3	2
Research and scholarly writing						
None	21	6	10	23	27	47
1–4	28	15	23	34	51	31
5–8	19	19	21	22	12	11
9–16	17	25	24	13	6	8
17–34	12	26	17	6	4	2
35+	4	9	4	2	*	1

*Less than 1%.
1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 7. Hours Spent in an Average Week on Professional Activities
(Row Percentages)

	Hours per week								
	Under 30	30–39	40–44	45–49	50–54	55–59	60+	Mean Hrs./Wk.	Median Hrs./Wk.
ALL FACULTY	13%	23%	17%	13%	16%	6%	12%	44 hrs.	43 hrs.
Faculty at:									
Two-Year Colleges	33	29	12	12	8	1	6	37	34
Liberal Arts Colleges	19	23	10	21	8	9	10	42	43
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	8	24	21	11	17	6	13	45	44
Doctoral-Granting Universities	8	22	21	12	18	6	13	46	44
Research Universities	7	20	17	15	21	7	14	46	46

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 8. Academic Levels of the Students Who Are Taught
(Row Percentages)

	Graduate students in a doctoral-level program	Graduate students in a masters degree-level program	Undergraduates majoring in your discipline	Undergraduates enrolled in introductory courses in your discipline
ALL FACULTY	13%	9%	38%	35%
Faculty at:				
Two-Year Colleges	0	0	23	77
Liberal Arts Colleges	0	*	61	
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	7	9	50	35
Doctoral-Granting Universities	17	17	44	22
Research Universities	37	14	32	17

*Less than 1%.
Question: "Please indicate which group of students among the following you consider to be your *primary* teaching responsibility."
1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 9. The Relative Claims of Teaching and Research
(Row Percentages)

	Very heavily in research	In both, but leaning toward research	In both, but leaning toward teaching	Very heavily in teaching
"Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research?"				
1977 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	7%	23%	35%	36%
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	4	21	38	37
1975 Carnegie Council Survey	4	21	36	39
1969 Carnegie Commission Survey	4	20	34	43
	Strongly agree	**Agree with reservations**	**Disagree with reservations**	**Strongly disagree**
"Teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty."				
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	36	38	20	6
1975 Carnegie Council Survey	40	36	18	6
1969 Carnegie Commission Survey	37	40	19	4
"Excessive commitment to research has so drawn energy and attention from teaching that the quality of undergraduate education has suffered significantly."				
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	27	44	23	6

Table 10. Teaching and Research Commitments
(Row Percentages)

	Very heavily in research	In both but leaning toward research	In both but leaning toward teaching	Very heavily in teaching
ALL FACULTY	7%	23%	35%	36%
Faculty at:				
Two-Year Colleges	0	8	23	69
Liberal Arts Colleges	3	8	48	42
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	4	18	41	38
Doctoral-Granting Universities	9	31	38	23
Research Universities	15	42	29	15
Under 35 years of age	20	46	24	9
35–44	16	44	30	10
45–54	11	40	31	18
55+	9	34	33	24

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 11. Professional Self-Perceptions
(Row Percentages)

	Teacher	Professional	Scientist	Scholar	Intellectual
ALL FACULTY	43%	27%	14%	11%	4%
Faculty at:					
Two-Year Colleges	56	37	2	3	2
Liberal Arts Colleges	64	11	11	6	8
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	54	25	9	10	3
Doctoral-Granting Universities	32	26	19	16	7
Research Universities	21	29	28	18	4

Question: "Some faculty members are inclined to think of themselves as 'intellectuals.' Others find 'scholar,' 'scientist,' 'teacher,' or 'professional' more satisfactory descriptors. Which of these terms describes you best?"

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

Table 12. Criticisms Directed at Higher Education
(Percentage agreeing strongly or with reservations)

	High student enrollment ill-suited for academia[1]	Academic standards have lowered[2]	Students unprepared in basic skills[3]	Institutional problem: grade inflation[4]	Personally not grading as hard[5]
ALL FACULTY	72%	81%	96%	94%	69%
Faculty at:					
Two-Year Colleges	70	84	100	94	62
Liberal Arts Colleges	79	85	96	91	65
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	74	83	98	98	74
Doctoral-Granting Universities	76	79	95	94	69
Research Universities	68	77	89	90	65
Under 35 years of age	70	81	89	93	67
35–44	67	76	90	89	60
45–54	64	78	89	90	65
55+	73	72	90	89	68

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

QUESTION TEXT:

1. "Too many people ill-suited to academic life are now enrolling in colleges and universities . . . (Strongly agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, or strongly disagree)."

2. "There has been a widespread lowering of standards in American higher education. . . (Strongly agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, or strongly disagree)."

3. "The students with whom I have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills—such as those required for written and oral communication. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."

4. "'Grade inflation' is a serious academic standards problem at my institution. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."

5. "I find myself not grading as 'hard,' not applying as high standards in assessing student work, as I believe I should. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."

Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty?

By Roger Baldwin

One response to "steady-state" conditions in higher education has been the recent enthusiasm for programs to enhance faculty development. This new interest probably arises from the stark realization that current faculty will be an institution's primary asset (sources of energy, ideas, and innovation) into the 21st century. Thus, greater concern has emerged for the general welfare, personal growth, and professional performance of college professors.

Concurrent with the new interest in faculty has been progress in the study of adult psychosocial development. This paper will examine major themes of developmental theory and try to relate these to the careers of college professors.

Theories of Development

The degree of popular interest in adult development is indicated by the recent spate of books on the topic. Sheehy's *Passages* (1976), Levinson's *Seasons of a Man's Life* (1978), and Gould's *Transformations* (1978) are three major examples.

Although each of these works has its own message, they all agree on one main theme—adults, like children and adolescents, continue to develop and change in significant ways. The theories suggest that each of us passes through a series of sequential (often age-related) life stages. Each stage of life provides different experiences and presents different tasks for the adult to complete. Hence, according to developmental theory, the character and needs of a person gradually change as he or she moves from one stage to the next (Levinson et al., 1976).

Of the adult development theories now available, I have found Levinson's to be the most concrete and useful. Levinson concludes that adulthood is composed of alternating periods of stability and transition. In a stable period (6-7 years) a person works to build a satisfactory life structure. (The life structure is the design or pattern of a person's life at any one time [Weathersby, 1978].) The adult must make important decisions about her or his lifestyle and direction and then work to pursue personal values and goals within the structure he or she has formed. Eventually, however, the assumptions, conditions, and behavior patterns of a stable period become inadequate to cope with changed circumstances in life. At this point the adult must enter a transitional period (4-5 years). Now the individual assesses her or his life situation and typically begins to alter her or his previous life structure. A transitional period can be an uncomfortable or even threatening time. A person must consider what elements of one's life (e.g., marriage, career) to maintain and which to redefine or abandon.

Levinson sees this sequential process continuing through the entire adult period. Each of the phases he defines (see Table 1) presents unique tasks and thus encourages the individual to continue developing. Assuming that college professors follow a similar pattern, it should be instructive to study faculty at different life stages.

Theories which examine more specific aspects of adult development may also enhance our understanding of the faculty career process. For example, career development theories focus on a very important element of adult life. The vocational career plays a major role in the psychosocial identity of most people. Thus, the work of career development theorists may be enlightening. I have found that the theories of Super (1957) and of Hall and Nougaim (1968) are particularly helpful in conceptualizing the academic career.

Career development models basically agree that an occupation (like life in general) proceeds through a series of stages (see Table 1) which present different challenges and require different responses. As an individual moves through these periods her or his interests, problems, and modes of behavior gradually evolve.

Super (1957) and Hall and Nougaim (1968) suggest that career stages are loosely linked to chronological age. The young adult generally enters a career provisionally and explores many options. Gradually this person selects a "permanent" vocation which complements her or his abilities and interests. He or she then works ambitiously to advance within this chosen field. Eventually, however, as the individual ages and as opportunities for advancement decrease, the career plateaus. From here on the worker maintains established working patterns and breaks little new ground professionally. As this "maintenance stage" progresses, the worker becomes increasingly detached from occupational pressures.

Developmental Research on Faculty

This brief review of developmental theory leads to one important question: What does it mean in the context of the faculty career?

At present there is little developmental research which focuses specifically on college teachers. Nevertheless, the few studies which compare professors at different ages and career stages are worthy of examination. In general these investigations show fairly significant differ-

Roger Baldwin is a Research Associate at the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, The University of Michigan.

Table 1. Developmental Periods Corresponding to Five Stages of the Academic Career*

Faculty Career Stage	Levinson's Developmental Stages		Super's Adult Career Development Stages		Hall and Nougaim's Adult Career Development Stages	
	Stage	Characteristic Experiences, Tasks	Stage	Characteristic Experiences, Tasks	Stage	Characteristic Experiences, Tasks
I. Assistant professor in the first three years of full-time college teaching.	Entering the Adult World (22-28)**	Effort to establish an occupation compatible with interests, values, self-concept. Envision a life dream (establish goals). Locate a mentor who can help young adult get established and pursue dream.	Establishment (25-45)	Following location of work which corresponds to a person's values and goals, the individual makes a commitment to his/her career; tries to advance within it.	Establishment (25-30)	Define structure of one's professional position and work to become secure within that role. Person has no strong organizational identity at this point.
II. Assistant professor with more than three years of college teaching experience.	Age Thirty Transition (28-33)	Reexamine initial commitments (e.g., marriage, occupation); question their value. Make desired changes in goals and life style.			Advancement (30-45)	Promotion and achievement within the career are major concerns.
	Settling Down (33-40)	Commitment to family usually deepens; life becomes more stable. Adult is concerned with achieving a position of importance in the work setting.				
III. Associate Professor	Becoming One's Own Person (Late Settling Down Stage, 36-40)	Strong need to achieve objectives set during early 30s (e.g., securing tenure by 38) as validation of self-worth. Desire affirmation by others of success in chosen roles. Wish to become a "senior" member of one's world, to speak with greater authority, to be a truly independent person.				

IV. Full professor more than five years from retirement	Mid-Life Transition (40-45)	Question what one has done with one's life. Must deal with disparity between achievements and goals (dream). Urgency of reassessment intensified by growing sense of aging. May eventually revise goals downward or initiate major changes in life.				
	Entering Middle Adulthood (46-50)	More stable period where person often establishes more intrinsic goals.	Maintenance (45-65)	Career plateaus. Little new ground is broken. Tendency to keep doing little things which helped one to get established. Person becomes increasingly detached from occupational and social pressures.	Maintenance (45-65)	Onset of a terminal plateau. Person has cues he/she is nearing the limits of his/her career advancement. Need or opportunity to compete decreases. May become concerned with helping younger people (one's successors) grow as a means to strengthen the organization (business, university, etc.) and perpetuate one's work.
	Ongoing process of transition and restabilization	Sequence of transitional and stable periods continues in later life. Individual development proceeds.				
V. Full professor within five years of retirement	Late Adult Transition (60-65)	Experience of bodily decline. Reduction of middle-adulthood responsibilities. Seek new balance of involvement with society and the self. Acceptance of one's failures and successes. Gain a sense of the overall meaning and value of one's life.				

*Sources for this chart are Hall and Nougaim (1968), Levinson et al. (1976, 1978), Super (1957), and Weathersby (1978).
**Age ranges for each of these theories are approximations and may vary by a few years.

ences among faculty at various career points.* For example, in a survey of faculty attitudes, Ladd and Lipset (1975) found "a neat progression (more liberal to more conservative) with movement from the youngest to the oldest [faculty] cohort." These differences emerged on matters from broad societal questions to purely campus concerns.

Likewise, Ladd and Lipset (1976a) and Fulton and Trow (1974) found changes in faculty attitudes toward their responsibilities. With increasing age, preference for research declined and preference for teaching increased.

Faculty work load is another factor which seems to vary over the career. For instance, Orlans (1962), Dunham, right, and Chandler (1966), and Thompson (1971) all found an inverse relationship between professional rank and time devoted to teaching responsibilities. Apparently, experienced faculty devote increasingly larger proportions of time to other duties (e.g., committee work, campus governance, consulting).

The productivity of faculty (as defined by publication) is a related issue. Research on this topic has produced conflicting results. Some studies (Lehman, 1953; Ladd and Lipset, 1976a) suggest that productivity declines with increased age or career stage. A few (Roe, 1953; Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958) indicate that productivity rises with age, and several researchers (Pelz and Andrews, 1966; Parsons and Platt, 1968; Blackburn, 1972) have found a saddle-shaped productivity curve—an early rise in productivity followed by a drop and then another rise.

Occupational satisfaction also seems to follow a developmental course. Although professors generally are highly satisfied with their career choice, most evidence (Eckert and Williams, 1972; Ladd and Lipset, 1976b) implies that career satisfaction increases with age.

The majority of these findings support the assumption that professors (like adults in general) continue their psychosocial development throughout life. These studies generally indicate that the academic career represents an evolutionary process.

The theories and research I have reviewed suggest that it can be productive to examine the academic career from a developmental frame of reference. The developmental perspective can help us understand faculty behavior. Knowledge gained from a developmental focus should also permit us to identify and respond to faculty strengths, weaknesses, and professional needs.

Research on Faculty at Five Career Stages

Based on the above assumptions, I recently conducted a study of the faculty career process. The purpose was to learn how college professors change over the course of a career. I wanted information that could help higher education enhance the growth and performance of faculty.

Liberal arts college professors from five stages of the academic career composed my sample:

I. Assistant professors in the first three years of full-time college teaching
II. Assistant professors with more than three years of college teaching experience
III. Associate professors
IV. Full professors more than five years from retirement
V. Full professors within five years of retirement

These periods correspond to stages defined by developmental theories (see Table 1).

A change in professors' allocation of time appears at successive stages of the career. Teaching and research gradually take smaller proportions of time, while department and college affairs, outside service, and professional activities take progressively more.

The professors I interviewed told me about their vocational values and goals. They discussed their professional assets and limitations and related their usual problem-solving techniques. They also revealed their sources of career satisfaction and frustration and shared their thinking about alternative careers.

I summarize the study's major findings here to heighten awareness of faculty career development and to generate responses to faculty needs. Most of my inferences are based on cross-sectional data collected from professors in one sector of higher education. Hence, generalizations based on this study should be made with some caution.

Trends in the data lead to several enlightening observations about the faculty career. Perhaps least surprising is the finding that academics have similar characteristics at all career stages. In particular, professors share common career goals (e.g., the intellectual and personal development of students, contribution to one's academic field) and enjoy many of the same aspects of the profession (e.g., the teaching function, the collegiate environment).

Differences in some faculty attributes, however, lend support to the developmental construct that adults do change significantly over time. My data reveal that faculty interests in some roles (e.g., research) gradually decrease as other interests (e.g., college-wide service [committees, alumni affairs, etc.]) increase. A complementary change in professors' allocation of time appears at successive stages of the career. Teaching and research gradually take smaller proportions of time, while department and college affairs, outside service, and professional activities take progressively more.

Professors also perceive changes in their major professional strengths and weaknesses as they gain experience.

*Most of these studies are cross-sectional (employing comparable populations at successive stages) rather than longitudinal (studying the same group over a period of time). As a result their findings are susceptible to cohort differences brought on by unique conditions at specific times. Thus, routine developmental changes may not account for all of the variance identified.

At successive career stages college professors see themselves becoming more adept at some roles (e.g., teaching, department and college affairs) while they become less confident or less comfortable with others (e.g., research).

The study identified periods which faculty commonly regard as difficult and others which they see as easy or smooth-running. Difficult times included the first few years (approximately 1-3) of college teaching. One young professor told me:

> The first year . . . was the most frustrating. I had new course preparations, so there was no time to keep up in my field or do my own research. Also, (as a new teacher) you are not confident that what you are doing will work.

Other difficult times included the period close to the tenure evaluation, times of new or increased responsibilities, and reassessment periods. (Reassessment periods are defined as occasions when failures, disappointments, loss of enthusiasm, or new interests cause faculty to question their careers' purpose or direction.)

There was less agreement on easy periods, but several phases of the career did emerge as less troublesome. First was the time following the initial adjustment to teaching (generally after 2-3 years of professional experience). Many associate professors also cited the times after promotions and the tenure decision as good career periods. These are occasions when faculty are receiving recognition for their professional efforts. Finally, many senior faculty (within five years of retirement) described their later years as smooth-running. By this time the professor is established professionally and has time to pursue her or his own interests. "Being a full professor is an ideal position," reflected a chemistry professor who was in his last year of teaching. "You have tenure, the respect of your colleagues, and a great deal of freedom. It can be just what you make it, a soft life or a very exciting life."

Pressure or stress in the academic career also seems to be related to years of experience. Faculty at all career levels indicated that their occupation generally does not generate a high degree of stress. Yet novice professors seem to be under more pressure than their seasoned colleagues. Beginning faculty recorded the highest level of career-related stress and retiring professors recorded the lowest.

Changes in professors' attributes and experiences appear to be accompanied by different methods of adapting to vocational demands. Experienced professors indicated that they are more independent than novice faculty. The former more frequently try to resolve professional problems independently, whereas the latter more often consult with current colleagues and contacts from graduate school, as well as personal friends and family members. Older faculty are also less likely to participate in formal faculty development activities (e.g., workshops, seminars) than are their younger (less experienced) counterparts.

Apparently the process of adult and career development also influences the vocational satisfaction of many professors. My findings suggest that satisfaction gradually increases over the career. Occupational satisfaction was lowest among new professors, especially assistant professors with several years of experience. These faculty are awaiting their tenure evaluation and thus face an uncertain career future. Satisfaction was highest among faculty who will soon be retiring from the profession. Faculty who were very satisfied and fairly satisfied with their overall career ranged from 46 percent of experienced assistant professors (Stage II) to 94 percent of retiring professors (Stage V).

This finding supports the developmental thesis that individuals gradually arrive at a match between their interests and abilities and their occupational responsibilities. As the discrepancy between these factors narrows, career satisfaction increases. It should be noted, however, that growth in satisfaction does not follow a straight incremental pattern. For example, a substantial proportion of continuing full professors (Stage IV) expressed reduced contentment with their careers.

Changes in career satisfaction are probably related to the process of career reassessment. Developmental theory suggests that individuals regularly pass through transitional stages. Here they assess their life situation and often revise their goals and means of achieving them. Evidently college faculty are no exception to this process. Many professors at all career stages said they had considered alternative career paths (e.g., changing academic fields, moving into administration, taking a job in business). This type of consideration, however, occurred most often at two career stages:

(1) The experienced assistant professor stage (II)
(2) The continuing full professor stage (IV)

Both are logical times for career reassessment. Experienced assistant professors must consider what will happen if they do not receive tenure. Continuing full professors must decide how to spend another 20 or more years in the teaching profession. Should they remain primarily classroom teachers or diversify their commitments as a means of maintaining their professional vitality? Somewhat typical is a 46-year-old religion professor. He began reassessing his career "Since turning 40. Since I stopped climbing to the top. After becoming a full professor and seeing that the college had nothing else to offer."

Overall, the interview data confirm that important development and change do occur throughout the academic career. Participants also listed critical events which had affected their career progression. These events tend to follow a loose sequential order which likewise indicates that the faculty career takes an evolutionary path. Four major types of critical events emerged:

(1) *The process of education and professional socialization*—This category includes experiences such as undergraduate education, graduate-school experiences (e.g., working with an influential advisor, passing prelims), and receipt of the PhD.

(2) *Early professional employment*—Many faculty also believed that their initial college teaching position (locating a position, adapting to the demands of academic life) had a significant impact on their subsequent career direction. In other words, the problems and performance of novice faculty members influence their later occupational progress.

(3) *Opportunities for professional growth* (e.g., seminars, sabbaticals, grants for study and research) also affected the careers of professors in this study. Faculty stated that potentially negative experiences like failures, disappointments, and value questions also had a major impact on their career direction and growth. This information concurs with the assumption that professional support and development efforts are beneficial to faculty careers.

(4) Likewise, many respondents viewed their *status and role changes* as important career events. In addition to the achievement of traditional faculty ranks, professors described new roles and new interests which continued to evolve long after receipt of the final formal academic title (full professor). Adoption of administrative roles, participation in campus governance, and increased involvement in professional organizations all suggest that many faculty careers develop and diversify almost to the time of retirement.

(Based on research evidence, I have written a composite description of the major attributes and experiences of professors at each of the five career stages studied. These descriptions appear in the Appendix.)

Developmental research has identified strengths and weaknesses (interests, knowledge, skills) which are prevalent at different career times. With this information a college dean or chairperson can estimate how best to capitalize on her or his faculty's assets.

Implications

Much of the available research shows that different professional experiences and needs characterize college teachers at various career stages. This information has meaning for academic administrators, professional development coordinators, and faculty interest or support groups. It can also be useful to individual professors in their career and life planning.

Developmental research has identified strengths and weaknesses (interests, knowledge, skills) which are prevalent at different career times. With this information a college dean or chairperson can estimate how best to capitalize on her or his faculty's assets. For instance, a new professor with up-to-date specialized knowledge and research expertise may be most qualified to teach certain upper-level courses, whereas an older faculty member with administrative experience and awareness of his institution's idiosyncrasies may be especially competent to chair a long-range-planning committee.

Data on faculty differences suggest when new opportunities or vocational assistance may be most beneficial. Currently, young academics are facing turbulent employment conditions characterized by a great deal of uncertainty. At the same time they are trying to adjust to new demands and perform their responsibilities effectively. My research has shown that early vocational experiences have a major impact on the later career development of college professors. This knowledge stresses the urgency of proper institutional support of new teachers. Perhaps a novice faculty member could benefit from consultation on her or his teaching skills. Likewise, a lighter committee load might enable a new professor to develop a professionally crucial research project. No matter what young professors' individual needs are, colleges should be sensitive to the working conditions of new faculty and attempt to create an environment conducive to effective teaching.

Similarly, full professors who are questioning their career goals or seeking to develop new professional skills may require a leave to try a different type of employment or a more liberalized early retirement policy. On the other hand, they may only need released time from one course to catch up on rapidly expanding developments in their academic field. Essentially, these brief examples illustrate that developmental data on faculty permit timely responses to individual professors' unique vocational circumstances.

The methods by which vocational assistance is offered, however, are also relevant to the effectiveness of faculty support efforts. My developmental findings suggest when professors may be most receptive to various modes of professional growth opportunities. For instance, I learned that young faculty typically welcome the assistance of more experienced colleagues. In contrast, large numbers of older faculty try to work out career problems independently. Newer professors are also more likely to take advantage of formal faculty development opportunities than are their more seasoned colleagues. Thus, a dean seeking to enhance faculty performance might ask an experienced faculty member to look after a recently hired assistant professor. The dean might also encourage new teachers to attend professional workshops and seminars. At the opposite end of the career spectrum, the chief academic officer could encourage senior faculty to design independent professional growth projects which he or she would monitor occasionally. The major point is that efforts to enhance faculty performance will be most effective if professors are comfortable with the development techniques employed.

One overall practical implication emerges from the available research. The policies and practices of colleges and universities must be flexible enough to accommodate the different vocational situations of professors at successive career stages. My study has shown that faculty frequently expand and diversify their activities beyond their initial teaching role. Institutions must maintain opportunities for this type of professional growth in order to keep their faculties challenged and enthusiastic.

Appendix*

I. *Assistant professors in the first three years of full-time college teaching*

These individuals are trying to get their careers established. They are seeking professional opportunities in a currently unstable academic employment environment. Thus they experience some pressure and concern about their future. New professors are adjusting to many novel demands, are trying to learn rapidly, and are receptive to help from others with more experience. These educators' careers are oriented primarily to teaching and limited research commitments. They are concerned with improving their performance in both areas. Novice academics are fairly enthusiastic about their young careers in higher education. (After all, they did locate teaching positions.) In some respects their career ambitions may be overly idealistic. Also, new professors have much to learn about the informal operations and modes of conduct in the complex organization known as a college or university.

II. *Assistant professors with more than three years of college teaching experience*

Experienced assistant professors are more confident about their abilities and performance than are their newer counterparts. They are also more sophisticated about their institution's methods of operation. Professors at this stage are seeking recognition and advancement, both of which are usually signified by the receipt of tenure. At the same time they may experience discontent with their teaching position, institution, or overall career achievements if these factors do not measure up to original hopes and expectations. Discontent may also surface if these professors fear their upcoming tenure evaluation will be negative. Now professors more seriously question their future in higher education. They sometimes think about alternative careers and may actively seek other employment opportunities. As they await the invitation to permanent membership in the academic community, they must identify options in case their bid for professional confirmation fails.

III. *Associate professors*

Associate professors tend to be enigmatic. They enjoy the peer recognition associated with tenure and promotion. Likewise, they are becoming a more integral part of their college community and are now more actively involved in various college-wide activities, especially important committees. In general, associate professors are satisfied with their career progress to date. Yet occasionally they are nagged by the fear that they have reached a dead end, that their career has plateaued and that they have nowhere to go professionally.

IV. *Full professors more than five years from retirement*

Essentially, continuing full professors have reached a watershed in their careers. They know that they have up to 25 years of employment left and are probably locked into higher education by their age, education level, and need for economic security. During this phase professors must decide whether to maintain the same basic career activities or move in a different direction. In a sense, they are faced with a choice between stagnation and diversification. During this period continuing full professors sometimes question the value of their vocation. After many years their enthusiasm for teaching and research has declined somewhat. Their comfort with students may also have decreased. Often full professors seek diversity and new challenges in their career. Through their own initiative, or due to institutional demands, they accept new roles or pursue new interests. They may develop new areas of expertise, experiment with admin strative jobs, or agree to chair significant faculty committees. They may even try to extend their sphere of influence beyond their own campus through more active involvement with professional organizations, journal editorships, consulting, and so on. Advanced faculty members who fail to "branch out" can fall victim to career inertia. Limited opportunities for professional growth may lead to disillusionment or depression, which can very likely affect the performance of these professors.

V. *Full professors within five years of retirement*

Retiring professors are characterized by a high degree of career satisfaction. They are somewhat reflective and generally content with their professional achievements. Senior faculty members are gradually withdrawing from their various responsibilities and thus have very limited goals for the future. They probably will not engage in any novel projects in the time remaining before retirement.

These faculty members also have decreased enthusiasm for teaching but are particularly comfortable with service to their department or college. Although professors near retirement feel little occupational pressure, they do recognize problems. In particular, they may fear that their knowledge is out of date, and their comfort with research may have diminished significantly. Yet at a time when efforts to enhance their skills might be beneficial, retiring professors seem isolated. They are quite likely to seek independent solutions to any teaching or research concerns. Likewise, there is only a 50/50 chance that they will take advantage of professional development opportunities.

*These descriptions are not meant to provide a comprehensive picture of faculty at each career level. Rather, they serve only to identify major attributes and experiences frequently characteristic of professors at different stages of their careers.

References

Baldwin, R.G. *The Faculty Career Process—Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1979.

Blackburn, R.T. *Faculty Responsiveness and Faculty Productivity as Functions of Age, Rank, and Tenure: Some Inferences from the Empirical Literature.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1972 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 059 703).

Dunham, R.E., Wright, P.S. & Chandler, M.O. *Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Spring, 1963.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Eckert, R.E. & Williams, H.Y. *College Faculty View Themselves and Their Jobs.* Minneapolis, Minn.: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1972.

Fulton, O. & Trow, M. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." *Sociology of Education,* 1974, *47* (1), 29-73.

Gould, R. *Transformations.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Hall, D.T. & Nougaim, K. "An Examination of Maslow's Need Hierarchy in an Organizational Setting." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 1968, *3,* 12-35.

Ladd, E.C. & Lipset. S.M. *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Ladd, E.C. & Lipset, S.M. "The Aging Professoriate." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 1976, *12,* (13), 16. (a)

Ladd, E.C. & Lipset, S.M. "What Do Professors Like Best About Their Jobs?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 1976, *12* (5), 10. (b)

Lazarsfeld, P.F. & Thielens, W. *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Lehman, H.C. *Age and Achievement.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Levinson, D.J. *The Seasons of a Man's Life.* New York: Knopf, 1978.

Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & McKee, B. "Periods in the Adult Development of Men: Ages 18 to 45." *The Counseling Psychologist,* 1976, 6 (1), 21-25.

Orlans, H. *The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1962.

Parsons, T. & Platt, G.M. *The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Pelz, D.C. & Andrews, F.M. *Scientists in Organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Roe, A. *The Making of a Scientist.* New York: Dodd, Mead, 1953.

Sheehy, G.M. *Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life.* New York: E.P. Dutton, 1976.

Super, D.E. *The Psychology of Careers: An Introduction to Vocational Development.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957.

Thompson, R.K. *How Does the Faculty Spend Its Time?* (mimeographed.) Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington, 1971.

Weathersby, R. "Life Stages and Learning Interests." *The Adult Learner.* In *Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

Academic Careers And Adult Development: A Nexus for Research

By B. Claude Mathis

The term "faculty development" covers interests ranging from specific concerns about improving instruction to more humanistic commitments to enhancing the personal lives of faculty in higher education. In between these shifting anchor points lies an area for research which is only now beginning to receive attention. Faculty development has suffered from a paucity of data about faculty members as professionals. In contrast, the extensive research literature about one element of practice within the academic profession—teaching—has provided the major research base for our understanding of faculty careers.

During the decade ahead, this unidimensional view of the faculty member as teacher should broaden to include the study of career patterns in academic settings, following the lead of the growing career development movement.

A recent review of research on career development by Super and Hall (12) begins with a discussion of the meaning of the word "career." The points made are worth quoting. According to Super and Hall (12, p. 333):

> . . . the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines "career" as "1.n. swift course, impetus (in full, mid, etc., career); course or progress through life or history; way of making a livelihood or advancing oneself . . . 2. v.t. Go swiftly or wildly (about)." It gives as its origin the Romantic *via carraria* and the Latin *carrus*, a cart or chariot. Those on whom the adventure has palled may take jaundiced pleasure in the idea that a chariot race has many of the characteristics of the "rat race" of the contemporary career! . . . Like it or not, people do "pursue" careers, just as they "engage in" occupations, "get jobs," "occupy" positions. The verbs thus in common usage are more precise and more communicative than the nouns . . . many people still mistakenly use the terms "career," "occupation," "job," and "position" as synonyms . . . In this review . . . a career is a sequence of positions occupied by a person during the course of a life-time.

This quotation underscores a distinction that must be considered in designing research on faculty career patterns—the distinction between the study of a career and the study of a job or an occupation. Careers are life-span pursuits which may include many different jobs. A faculty member may perform a wide range of tasks during the span of a career.*

Influencing Faculty Careers at Four Functional Stages

Super and Hall (12) use Erikson's stages of development for the adult years (2) and Levinson and his associates (8) suggest that adult career stages follow a pattern which conforms roughly to the Erikson stages of identity, intimacy, generativity, and integrity. Baldwin's (1) trenchant linking of theories of adult development and phases of career development for faculty uses a model which classifies faculty stages in terms of academic rank. My own thinking follows a much more simplistic schema which identifies four functional stages during a faculty member's career where controlled interventions can influence the future course of particular careers (9). These are as follows:

(1) *Interventions during the graduate preparation of the future faculty member*—Preparation for academic careers, particularly in elitist, traditional institutions, emphasizes competency for research and scholarship tasks. Very little is done to prepare beginning faculty members for career demands involving teaching and professional service, yet most research indicates that teaching and professional activities both within and outside of one's institution become increasingly important as one progresses through a career. Research and scholarship are primarily important in determining promotion and tenure, but they become less important as a mechanism for maintaining enthusiasm and motivation as a faculty member enters mid-career. Information about career patterns in higher education should be a part of *all* doctoral programs, regardless of discipline, for those who plan to enter the academic professions. Perhaps the most neglected preparation at the pre-professional level is attention given to the teaching which is universally expected of academics. Early rewards for effective teaching can initiate patterns which provide a basis for satisfaction throughout an academic career.

(2) *Interventions during the initial years of a faculty member's first appointment and during the first several years of subsequent appointments*—The initial socialization which occurs in introducing a faculty member to his or her first job, and to subsequent jobs, is quite important in

B. Claude Mathis is Director of the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern University.

*The emerging field of adult development is an important parallel subject of study for those interested in investigating career patterns, because the literature on adult development is not confined to specific jobs or occupations. The important works of Erikson (2), Gould (3), Hall (4), Kanter (6), Krantz (7), Levinson (8), Sarason (10), Sheehy (11), and Super and Hall (12), pertain to the study of careers in specific organizational contexts, but they do not represent information which is limited by a concern about a specific job in a specific organization. For this reason, the studies of Baldwin (1) and the CRLT group (13) are important continuations of investigations about faculty and their careers.

giving faculty members the skills they need to manage their careers. Hodgkinson (5) writes of the importance of a mentor for men in this process. The traditional introduction to a first job in higher education is one which is designed along the dimensions of a stress test. The survivors are the ones who are able to select information from the informal communication network, as well as the formal, which is predictive of advancement to tenure or a secure mid-career position. Survivors may have the skills associated with unravelling the complexities of organizational values, but they may also lack the skills which will carry them through the course of an academic career without serious conflicts at more advanced stages. Survival in a career is too important to be left at the beginning to the skill of intuition. In a decade which may well be characterized by the importance of faculty governance, either in the mode of collective bargaining or institutional accommodations, socialization issues for beginning faculty should be brought out of the closet and made part of the policy structure of higher education. The greatest investment an institution will make during the decade of the 80s is likely to be in the selection of a beginning faculty member. The productivity of that faculty member is directly related to whether or not he or she has the skills the institution wishes to reward, and to whether or not the faculty member receives early rewards for applying those skills. Both the "pay-off" patterns in the job and the nature of the reward structure should be obvious to the faculty member from the beginning. The same should apply in instances of job changes within a career pattern. Dissonance in the organizational structure of the institution can affect th quality of education, both through greater costs for replacing faculty who do not stay and lower morale for those who remain. Entry into any profession should be a significant growth period, if initial selection has been reliable. To the degree that initial selection does not lead to significant growth for new faculty, the cost of effective education is increased.

(3) *Interventions during the middle and later years of faculty career patterns*—The literature of adult development dwells on the mid-career crisis to the extent of encouraging guilt and anxiety in those who do not consciously recognize their need to have a crisis. A "mid-career" stage is not bound by age, regardless of the chronological categories assigned to developmental themes by most writers. After a faculty member has acquired tenure, a full professorship, and a good salary, his or her attitudes begin to change; the things which were important at the beginning are no longer the motivating forces they once were. The mid-career crisis for most faculty is not an exhaustion of talent and commitment. Rather, it is brought on by the increasing expenditure of energy required to maintain a career on the same terms by which it reached mid-point in the first place. The extrinsic incentives which create a commitment to interests necessary to acquire a reputation among peers, as well as promotion and tenure, are not always the same incentives which help us focus our energies on maintaining a reputation. Many mid-career faculty will privately admit that their satisfactions at this time of life are not the same as those at an earlier age; nevertheless, they feel the need to continue their past directions because their peers expect it of them. This invites a ritualization of career behaviors and demands the expenditure of greater amounts of energy at a time when an adult's energy level may be decreasing. These transition phases in careers are critical times which will determine whether one decides to do the same work each year until retirement, or whether the remaining years provide a unique series of experiences which help us generate energy for the satisfactions ahead.

One of the attractions of a career in higher education is the organizational flexibility which permits the full professor with tenure to find his or her place within the system when traditional categories do not fit. A richness within this system will be lost if the next decade decreases these opportunities for flexibility. Most predictions about the future of higher education support the conclusion that the average age of faculty, at least in traditional institutions, will continue to increase throughout the 1980s, so that the average will be about fifty years of age by the beginning of the 1990s. The old will be professing to the young. Some attention to this issue by administrators will be needed to help bridge the generation gap. At this mid-career point, we need to know much more about how careers are maintained, how they continue to grow, and why they begin to decline long before retirement. Keeping older faculty enthusiastic about their careers represents one of the greatest challenges to higher education during the decade of the 80s. This enthusiasm has a direct cost in terms of productivity and the quality of educational efforts; yet older faculty are the most neglected faculty group in terms of knowledge about their incentives and interests. Fortunately, research is beginning to fill this void.

(4) *Interventions which help the older faculty member prepare for retirement and sustain some productivity of choice after retirement*—Retired individuals may be our greatest national resource in the years ahead. Retired faculty who wish to maintain an identity with the institution which provided them with opportunities for development during their formative years should be allowed access to the resources of the institution. Such amenities as a parking space, a library permit, a mailbox, and other services have great meaning to most faculty as an incentive to productive effort until retirement. Participation in faculty meetings, receipt of faculty minutes, and occasional invitations to come back to one's career home are the things which make emeritus status meaningful. The realization that one becomes a nonentity at a certain age will certainly influence the quality of one's performance the closer one gets to the separation year. Retirement should be a transition in the career pattern, and not an end of all that has gone before.

Experience suggests that faculty satisfaction is related to the degree to which the values of a given discipline are consonant with the goals of the institution.

To these four levels of intervention in career stages I would add a fifth, which occurs throughout the course of an academic career, and which introjects dissonance at every transition phase. This level involves the definition of professionalism that professional associations and learned societies communicate to faculty. Most associations indoctrinate beginning faculty with attitudes and values which emphasize as valuable only the research and scholarship dimensions of faculty role. Our disciplines, and their membership associations, do not define the role of faculty member, yet we behave as if they do. Fortunately, some associations are beginning to recognize responsibilities to their members for helping them be more effective teachers of their disciplines. The American Sociological Association, among others, has initiated constructive efforts to broaden its definition of professionalism. Whether or not one chooses to identify with his or her institution, or with a discipline, can shape values which sow the seeds of discontent for a later time in the life of many institutions. Experience suggests that faculty satisfaction is related to the degree to which the values of a given discipline are consonant with the goals of the institution. In order for this correlation to be high, professional associations and learned societies which have faculty as members must develop a broader definition of faculty role than that which tradition has ordered.

The more we know about what makes a faculty member, in different types of institutions, enthusiastic and productive throughout the length of a career, the more we will be able to control the economics of higher education and at the same time insure quality in whatever context education is offered.

The Institutional Role in Career Management

How can postsecondary institutions examine their policies to make career management a goal which is supported and encouraged for faculty? A number of options are possible:

(1) Institutions could publicly recognize that research which examines faculty career patterns should be supported and encouraged. Institutional variations in career options should be studied. We should recognize that knowledge about careers in progress is as important as research about entry into a career. The more we know about what makes a faculty member, in different types of institutions, enthusiastic and productive throughout the length of a career, the more we will be able to control the economics of higher education and at the same time insure quality in whatever context education is offered.

(2) Research about women faculty is almost nonexistent. Nearly all the research on adult development is applicable only to men in careers. Affirmative-action programs will continue to increase the number of women and/or minorities who become faculty members in institutions of higher education. The career patterns and transitions, and the professional reinforcements for these persons may not be the same as for traditional male faculty. The best interests of women and/or minority faculty are not served by recruiting exceptional talent and discarding it at the end of a probationary period simply because the universe of success is one which is defined by white male standards. When we encourage research about faculty careers, we must recognize that there is more than one kind of faculty member.

(3) Differences between traditional and nontraditional institutions must be defined in terms of patterns of career development for faculty. At the present time, most faculty in nontraditional institutions are persons who have graduated from doctoral and masters programs in traditional institutions. The traditional graduate program includes recognition of few of the skills associated with success in community colleges or off-campus educational programs. The separation between traditional and nontraditional education which Martin (9) convincingly identifies will continue to create two contrasting career patterns for postsecondary institutions. To assume that a definition of one is applicable to the other is to ignore a critical reality.

(4) Research about faculty careers is too important to leave totally in the hands of specialists in higher education. Each discipline and profession represented in higher education should assume some responsibility for studying career patterns in its domain. Several professions, notably medicine, hold that part of the responsibility of the profession to its members is the study of careers. However, disciplines such as English and history, among others, have made little if any beginning toward the study of careers in their fields. Valid research about faculty careers must recognize the diverse character of higher education.

Higher education is one of the most labor-intensive industries in the United States, and it faces the prospect of becoming a declining industry during the 1980's. Labor-intensive, declining industries have fewer options for maintaining quality and sustaining productivity than industries which are expanding. The more we know about faculty careers, the greater the probability that the survival mentality, with its debilitative attitudes of retrenchment and retreat, can be contained. Research about career development and management in higher education, as a specific application of inquiry about adult and organizational development, could provide the kind of information and credibility necessary for enticing all academic disciplines and professions into the arena of discourse. When that happens, faculty development will have found its meaning and its data base.

References

1. Baldwin, R. G., *The Faculty Career Process—Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career*, Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, University of Michigan, 1979.

2. Erikson, E. H. (Ed.), *Adulthood*, New York: Norton, 1978.
3. Gould, R. L., *Transformations*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
4. Hall, D. T., *Careers in Organizations*, Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing, 1976.
5. Hodgkinson, H. L., "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators," *Educational Record*, 55, Fall (1974), 263-274.
6. Kanter, R. M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books, 1977.
7. Krantz, D. L., *Radical Career Change*, New York: Free Press, 1978.
8. Levinson, D. J., et al, *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, New York: Knopf, 1978.
9. Mathis, B. C., *Persuading the Institution to Experiment—Strategies for Seduction*, Center for the Teaching Professions, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1974.
10. Sarason, S. B., *Work, Aging, and Social Change*, New York: Free Press, 1977.
11. Sheehy, Gail, *Passages*, New York: Dutton, 1976.
12. Super, D. E., and Hall, D. T., "Career Development: Exploration and Planning," In Rosenzweig, M. R., and Porter, L. W. (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 29, 1978, 333-372.
13. "The Dimensions of Merit," *Memo to The Faculty*, 61, December (1978), Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan.

Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities

By Robert T. Blackburn

Introduction

In discussing faculty careers, it is important to keep in mind the factors that often introduce some modification to general truths about faculty:

(1) The differences that occur across institutional types—two-year colleges, private liberal arts colleges, regional universities, research universities, and so forth;

(2) The differences that exist between faculty in different disciplines (in the applied sciences in contrast to the humanities, for example);

(3) The differences which exist between men and women; and

(4) The differences which result from the nature of the work the professor conducts (research, teaching, governance).

One also needs to be aware of a second type of caveat. Most of the evidence cited to support the assertions that are made have to do with faculty productivity. More specifically, most often studies define productivity as the number of research articles published. What is argued is that the characteristics of those who publish articles—about 10 percent of all academics—hold true for all faculty when productivity is more generally defined to include all individuals who are creative and productive in whatever domain and environment they work. What is claimed is that the basic characteristics which identify article publishers will also hold true for curriculum reformers, for professors who try new teaching methods, for academics who prepare proposals, and for faculty who have exciting ideas and develop them, irrespective of the type of college at which they work.

With this qualifier and major assumption understood, we can turn to some statements about academic careers.

There are productive and non-productive people and the discrepancy between them increases over time as the productive people maintain their high level and the less productive become even less so.

Robert T. Blackburn is Professor of Higher Education at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan.

Nine Assertions About Academic Careers

Three general truths are of a sociological kind, three are of a personal/psychological kind, and three can be classified as social-psychological.

(1) *The productivity of faculty over an entire career is predictable*—While the amount will vary from individual to individual, age of first product and age of receiving the advanced degree determine to an appreciable extent career productivity. (Raymond, 1967; Bayer and Dutton, 1977; Blackburn, Beheymer, and Hall, 1978.)

(2) *The institution determines to a high degree a faculty member's productivity*—Faculty at some colleges and universities produce appreciably more than faculty at other institutions, and this differential rate is independent of place of preparation, ability, workload, and prior places of work. (Berlson, 1960; Crane, 1965; Clements, 1973; Long, 1978; Blackburn and Havighurst, 1979.)

(3) *Organizational factors influence faculty productivity*—Such matters as leadership (Thorp, 1970) and support (Meltzer, 1956), control of the environment (Cares and Blackburn, 1978), and colleague selection/retention by peers (Cole and Cole, 1973) correlate with faculty output.

(4) *How time is structured affects productivity*—Time—or rather the lack of it—is the critical faculty complaint (Baldwin, 1979), a source of stress which affects performance (Clark and Blackburn, 1973). It can be partitioned in ways that are more or less effective (Birnbaum, 1977).

(5) *Faculty interests and desire for different types of work change over the academic career*—For example, interest in research (but not amount produced) lessens over time (Fulton and Trow, 1974), and interest in teaching waxes, wanes, and waxes again over a career (Baldwin, 1979).

(6) *Age is not a predictor of productivity over a career path*—Productivity does decline with increasing age for all faculty, it is true, but only very slightly for many people (Blackburn, 1972). The more accurate statement is that there are productive and non-productive people and the discrepancy between them increases over time as the productive people maintain their high level and the less productive become even less so (Lightfield, 1971; Allison and Stewart, 1974).

(7) *Mentorship/sponsorship in the first years is critical for launching a productive career*—Learning the informal network that supports productivity—the inner workings of professional associations and who the productive

people are, for example—is critical, especially in the faculty member's first years (Nagi and Corwin, 1972; Crane, 1972; Lodahl and Gordon, 1972; Cameron, 1978).

(8) *Faculty productivity over a career is affected by security and by challenge (competition)*—Uncertainty and fear of risk-taking stifles productivity, but tension and competition produces better results than placid security (Ben-David, 1968; Pelton, 1970, Pelz and Andrews, 1976).

(9) *Rewards affect faculty performance, and intrinsic rewards dominate extrinsic ones*—While those who are more productive receive greater rewards (Tuckman, 1976), the evidence suggests that faculty are productive principally because of the inner satisfactions they receive. That is, faculty receive recognition from their organization in terms of dollars, titles, and promotions but do not seek it for that reason (March and Stafford, 1967; McKeachie, 1978).

What the data on faculty productivity and creativity imply is that a rather free-wheeling/dealing, entrepreneurial, non-supervised environment is the best one.

Some Inferences To Be Drawn from These "Facts"

- Faculty productivity/creativity, both individually and especially collectively, is far short of its potential. Professional and organizational development have a long way to go before achieving optimum (to say nothing of maximum) performance.

- Better teaching would result from increasing faculty productivity/creativity. The correlates between teaching and scholarship and between scholarship and service are positive, not zero or negative (Blackburn, 1972; Fulton and Trow, 1974; Lanning and Blackburn, 1979).

- In many if not most cases, both individual and collective faculty productivity/creativity could be greatly increased since nearly every positively correlated factor resides in administrative hands and hence can be fostered by the organization. For example, selection of faculty can be better, decisions about retention certainly can be greatly improved by eliminating early mistakes (one can rightfully say that tenure is not what causes people to be unproductive, but rather than "nice" but unproductive people get tenured), rewards can be altered, time frames can be changed, and much better work climates can be developed.

- Our colleges need to select administrators whose comforts and personal rewards call for a minimum need to control (Blau, 1973). What the data on faculty productivity and creativity imply is that a rather free-wheeling/dealing, entrepreneurial, non-supervised environment is the best one. Both support and challenge are needed, but so is a faith that if faculty are left to pursue their own desires, they will simultaneously contribute to organizational goals, including creating a good learning environment for students.

- Were colleges to act so as to increase faculty creativity and productivity, they would be simultaneously contributing to the much needed research on adult development and career stages.

References

Allison, Paul D. and John A. Smart. "Productivity Differences Among Scientists: Evidence for Accumulative Advantage." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4, August, 1974, pp. 596-606.

Baldwin, Roger. "The Faculty Career Process—Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1979.

Bayer, Alan E. and Jeffrey E. Dutton. "Career Age and Research-Professional Activities of Academic Scientists." *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 48, No. 3, May-June, 1977, pp. 259-282.

Ben-David, Joseph. *Fundamental Research and the Universities: Some Comments on International Differences*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1968.

Berelson, Bernard. *Graduate Education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Birnbaum, Robert. "Calendar and Culture." Paper at Association for Innovation in Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 21, 1978.

Blackburn, Robert T. *Tenure: Aspects of Job Security on the Changing Campus*. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, Research Monograph No. 19, July, 1972.

Blackburn, Robert T., Charles E. Behymer, and David E. Hall. "Research Note: Correlates of Faculty Publications." *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 51, April, 1978, pp. 132-141.

Blackburn, Robert T. and Robert J. Havighurst. "Career Patterns of Male Academic Social Scientists," *Higher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 5, September, 1979 (in press).

Blau, Peter M. *The Organization of Academic Work*. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Cameron, Susan M. "Women Faculty in Academia: Sponsorship, Informal Social Networks, and Career Success." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1978.

Cares, Robert C. and Robert T. Blackburn. "Faculty Self-Actualization: Factors Affecting Career Success." *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 9, 1978, pp. 123-136.

Clark, Mary Jo and Robert T. Blackburn. "Faculty Performance Under Stress." In *Faculty Effectiveness as Evaluated by Students*, Alan L. Sockloff (ed.) Temple University, Philadelphia, 1973, pp. 233-252.

Clemente, Frank. "Early Career Determinants of Research Productivity." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 79, No. 2, 1973, pp. 409-419.

Cole, Jonathan R. and Stephen Cole. *Social Stratification in Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Crane, Diana. "Scientists at Major and Minor Universities: A Study of Productivity and Recognition." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 30, No. 8, October, 1965, pp. 699-714.

Crane, Diana. *Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Fulton, Oliver and Martin Trow. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 47, Winter, 1974, pp. 29-73.

Lanning, Alan and Robert T. Blackburn. "Faculty Consulting and the Consultant." *Resources in Education*, February, 1979.

Lightfield, E. Timothy. "Output and Recognition of Sociologists." *American Sociologist*, Vol. 6, May, 1971, pp. 128-133.

Lodahl, Janice B. and Gerald Gordon. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Functioning of University Graduate Departments." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 37, February, 1972, pp. 57-72.

Long, J. Scott. "Productivity and Academic Position in the Scientific Career." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 43, December, 1978, pp. 889-908.

McKeachie, W. J. "Financial Incentives Are Ineffective for Faculty." Mimeographed copy, 1978.

Marsh, John and Frank Stafford. "The Effects of Values on Pecuniary Behavior: The Case of Academicians," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 32, October, 1967, pp. 740-754.

Meltzer, Leo. "Scientific Productivity in Organizational Settings." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 12, 1956, pp. 32-40.

Nagi, Saad Z. and Ronald G. Corwin (eds.). *The Social Contexts of Research*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.

Pelton, Terrance R. "Canadian Scientists: Their Research Department Structure and Research Output in Four Types of Organizations." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1970.

Pelz, Donald C. and Frank M. Andrews. *Scientists in Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1966 (revised, 1976).

Raymond, Jerral C. "Publications, Production of Knowledge, and Career Patterns of American Economists." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Virginia, 1967.

Thorp, Cary D., Jr. "The Administration of Research in Universities: An Investigation into the Influence of Department Chairmen and Research Directors on the Satisfaction and Productivity of Research Professors." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1970.

Tuckman, Howard P. *Publication, Teaching, and the Academic Reward Structure*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Co., 1976.

Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview

By Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin

For no one is the current crisis in academe more difficult than for junior faculty. Graduate students have their departments or advisors to help them; senior faculty have their tenure or their unions. Junior faculty, often located in completely new settings, tend to be viewed by no one as a special constituency. Their individual graduate departments consider them "placed" and breathe a sigh of relief. The senior faculty at the new institution may be too demoralized, guilty, distant, or involved in research to lend a hand, and since junior faculty are often competing with each other for tenured positions, they may find it difficult to help each other. Administrators, who often have attended more carefully to their need for a constant flow of new ideas and new people than to considering the impact of reduced prospects on people, must share part of the blame for this problem.

Although it is possible that only radical measures can effectively address the current employment crisis, there are successful models for programs that administrators can institute to help junior faculty get tenure, move to other academic positions outside the institutions where they are currently employed, or redirect their careers.

These programs may prove efficacious by:

(1) Identifying and encouraging promising young faculty.
(2) Teaching both junior and senior faculty to analyze and negotiate the "system."
(3) Providing a form of "faculty development" for faculty at all levels.
(4) Forging and/or cementing faculty ties across disciplinary or interdisciplinary lines.
(5) Giving all faculty a sense of control or at least partial control over their futures.
(6) Strengthening career development skills which will remain useful, in or outside of academic life.

Mentors, Sponsors, and Networks

How can these goals be accomplished? Some of the current "sexy" words in education circles are "mentor," "sponsor," and "network." They speak to a fundamental necessity for some sort of guidance, assistance, and/or fellowship in negotiating the rough waters of academic life.

Active support from inside and outside an institution can help the junior faculty member understand the politics and economics of academe. It can also help her/him get into the best position to succeed either in getting tenure or in moving on to another institution where tenure is more likely.

Some programs already exist. At MIT, Mary Rowe, Special Assistant to the President for Women and Work, organized a set of academic mentors* for each individual in a group of entering junior faculty. In addition to mentors from inside the institution, chosen by a variety of means and legitimized by university support and encouragement, the support group included persons outside the department or university who were familiar with some aspect of the field in which the individual worked. The group did not meet; it was not formally organized. The benefits to individuals were institutional assistance in finding a group of interested persons to encourage and advise them in their work, assurance of national recognition in the tenure decision process, and a network of interested colleagues that could be helpful when the individual prepared to move on.

Mary Lewis Weaver of HERS-New England suggests a "buddy" system, which is something like an "equal but opposite" variation of the MIT experiment. In her "sponsor system," each new junior faculty person is assisted in identifying a senior faculty "buddy" in a department other than her/his own. This system is based on the idea that it is helpful to have an overview of the institution and that it is important to help junior faculty make judgments about their positions and opportunities from an extra-departmental vantage point. It takes time to find the right buddy, but it should be done by the end of the first year, not two months before the contract renewal or tenure decision is pending. Junior faculty need to plan early in order to stay in, as well as to leave academia. Institutional backing in establishing such a "system" takes the onus off an individual, whose extra-departmental fraternization might otherwise be viewed as irregular behavior by the department. This system is designed to solve some political rather than strictly academic problems.

Another way to help junior faculty is by institutionally encouraging career cooperatives for junior faculty; that is, to organize groups to discuss academic careers. A pilot career-cooperative program for junior faculty was developed by HERS-New England as part of a program of Career Counseling Workshops for women, a national project funded by the Carnegie Corporation. HERS has three agenda for these workshops:

(1) To learn something about academic women's career

Barbara Lazarus is Director of Career Services at Wellesley College; Martha Tolpin is Associate Director of Higher Education Resource Services (HERS-New England) at Wellesley College.

*The terms "mentor" and "sponsor" are used loosely here and do not represent particular relationships as defined in the growing educational and sociological literature.

paths and the usefulness of various strategies to promote upward mobility.

(2) To teach skills such as interviewing to finishing PhDs and junior faculty, to assist them in attacking the academic marketplace.

(3) To build networks of academic women, which is done by having groups of women in related disciplines work together in a full day of workshop activities such as practice-interviewing or "network-building."

In the HERS program, career cooperatives are the natural result of a contrived process. By bringing together people who may not have met or previously worked cooperatively and providing a catalytic presence and practical information, HERS also seeks to engender sufficient cohesion and trust among these persons, so that they continue to meet together after the workshop day is over for mutual assistance in academic career development. Although the career cooperatives are composed of groups of peers, on the first workshop day a senior person works with a group, thus providing a link to a more established academic network.

Any institution could boost the morale and the careers of its faculty and administrators by helping to establish career cooperatives. These groups work best when they are linked with sympathetic senior faculty who can help the junior faculty assess their situations and consider ways of investigating positions at other institutions. Senior faculty will often feel less discouraged in their own crisis years if they can be useful in assisting others to make inroads in the academic job market. Simply helping another person acquire information about a job via one's own academic network—discovering that one has a network—can be an empowering experience. Some faculty assist junior colleagues as routinely as they help their own graduate students. In places where this is not the case, administrative support might encourage senior faculty who wish to help, but do not know how, to coalesce around a program.

The three kinds of programs suggested for assisting junior faculty—the Rowe sponsor arrangement, the Weaver buddy system, and the HERS career cooperatives—were all originally developed to help women overcome the disadvantages inherent in their minority position in academe. These disadvantages were mainly seen as being the lack of opportunities for socialization into the political and social aspects of the profession. This usually resulted from the sparsity of senior women in the disciplines and/or the fact that men traditionally failed to recognize the junior women in their fields as sufficiently like themselves to warrant professional and economic advancement and recognition. As with affirmative action, which has transformed personnel procedures to benefit women (who would not have been part of any real or imagined "old-boys network" in previous years), these programs benefit the morale and careers of women and men, junior and senior faculty alike.

In the present employment crisis, one of the most devastating experiences for a bright, capable person is to experience a sense of failure. Despite everything we know about statistics of employment of PhDs, the individual whose contract is not renewed or who does not receive tenure generally blames herself or himself rather than the system. This penchant for self-destruction among academics is often accentuated by our regrettable habit of judging, and often rejecting, junior faculty after one or three years of teaching and research as though they were finished products off an assembly line, to be accepted or rejected. It is particularly ironic that educational institutions treat their most important resource as ineducable. The institution which can devise a "faculty development" program in teaching effectiveness to assist junior *and* senior faculty without threatening either one with immediate humiliation, death or destruction, will do a great deal to ensure both good morale generally and a junior faculty confident of its skills and its future, in one institution or another.

It is particularly ironic that educational institutions treat their most important resource as ineducable.

Entering Higher Education Administration

One of the first alternative thoughts of faculty members who see no future in faculty ranks is an administrative career. A faculty member considering such a change should ask her or himself whether she or he is suited for administration. Despite the similar setting, the work life of an administrator is very different from that of a faculty member. Administrators work a different schedule, usually 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, 11 months a year, and they have different responsibilities. In fact, their work lives may resemble those of colleagues in business and government more than those of faculty colleagues.

Too often we see the academic world in rosy colors, with groups of colleagues working together towards a common aim, honestly and openly expressing differences of opinion, and setting a vigorous but contemplative pace. The reality is that many junior faculty members must begin to look outside faculty ranks for jobs. They should make lists of the activities involved in their jobs. They should decide whether they find these activities important and/or interesting. They should learn to identify the skills used to perform these tasks to find out which skills are required for success. They should explore career options outside academe as well as within academe. For example, it is important that they know that American industry spends more dollars annually on education than all colleges and universities in the country combined. Even if one wants primarily to be an "educator," there are many more places to educate than academe. In fact, in many ways a job *outside academe* may have more desirable qualities than might be imagined.

To put it simply, there are three different kinds of administrative possibilities within academe: academic administration, student affairs, and general (including business) management. The former is the only sector

where a PhD is the necessary credential. However, finding a job within academic administration may not be easy for junior faculty, since opportunities in the academic line of administration are more accessible to senior faculty, and other options in the institution may be closed. A PhD in history is not seen as a good credential for work in admissions, financial aid, development, and a number of other possibilities. Non-academic departments may even be suspicious of these candidates. Often their attitude toward junior faculty seems to be "Why should we hire someone who can't make it in her/his own department?" No wonder junior faculty are demoralized; their plight isn't even understood within their own environment. In fact, it may seem as if the hiring process within an institution is designed to squeeze out junior faculty permanently.

Who can help? At HERS-Mid-Atlantic and HERS-New England, colleagues have developed administrative skills-training programs for women in higher education administration. Although both programs are addressed primarily to the needs of people already involved in college and university administration, the courses are available to faculty, some of whom are making decisions about entering academic administration. These programs serve both individuals interested in career mobility in academia and institutions needing well-trained administrators.

HERS programs have been so successful that institutions might be urged to develop their own programs for junior faculty in all three areas of administration: student affairs, general management, and academic affairs. This model has even been tested by industries, such as IBM and Polaroid, as a way of easing tensions and developing a pool of well-trained, long-term employees.

At Wellesley College we are beginning to counsel individual faculty members on opportunities within the academic setting for gaining administrative skills. Junior faculty have spent most of their adult years focused on one goal. They cannot be expected to understand how they might relate the skills they have gained to another goal and/or how to acquire new skills without assistance. Senior faculty may also benefit from a skill-development and analysis program—thus leaving open positions which junior faculty may fill. With the assistance of the many self-help books on the market, our counselors can help clients define their goals, do a skills analysis of their accomplishments, and develop a plan to fill the gaps by taking advantage of opportunities in the community.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as many as 40 percent of those earning PhDs from 1976 to 1985 might need to seek jobs not traditionally held by PhDs. In the arts and humanities, education, and business and commerce the oversupply could exceed 60 percent.

Institutions can use existing staff in this way to fill this need, but real support is crucial to success. Some individual and/or program must be given *specific* responsibility *and* a budget for this purpose.

Seeking Jobs Outside Academia

A few weeks ago, a junior faculty member mentioned in a conversation about her job search that she would "even be willing to seek jobs outside the academic sphere in business or government." Seeking alternatives outside the academic institution clearly is a popular alternative. We all know someone who has done it, but the specifics are usually vague.

There are many careers outside the academic institution that could be suitable for academics. The first step for junior faculty considering a career transition is an understanding of the nature of various markets. They also need to become familiar with basic differences in job-search techniques. For example, while the academic market often uses a nationally advertised search as at least a token part of the hiring process, various non-academic markets rarely do. People searching for a job outside an academic institution must learn how to sell employers on their own unique qualifications and skills.

How can they learn this? As is the case with administrative jobs, individuals or groups within or outside an institution can help faculty members assess skills, learn how to seek job opportunities, and work with employers to convince them that they have transferable skills. A service such as the University of Michigan's Office of Non-Academic Career Counseling and Placement, which performs these services for graduate students, could easily accommodate the needs of junior faculty.

The strength of the match between an academic degree and a job outside academia is dependent upon an individual's specialization, her/his experience in and outside the institution, and the actual demands of a particular job. But it is also dependent upon the *perceived* relevance of the skills. For example, a professor of business administration does have greater mobility in the business world than a professor of English, not necessarily because her or his skills are more appropriate for business, but because they are so perceived. Of course, actual skills are important. For example, a professor of English who has assumed administrative responsibilities (e.g. chair of a department) may have greater mobility than a colleague who only teaches. An assistant professor who has experience teaching freshman creative writing may have good opportunities for moving into corporations eager to teach writing skills to their executives.

Who else can help? If it is not feasible to establish an office of career planning specifically geared for faculty, like the model at Michigan, it is possible to designate responsibility for faculty counseling to a specific person within an existing office of career planning and placement, as is the case at Wellesley and at a number of other schools. With a little creativity, these kinds of offices can use most of the career-counseling techniques in vogue today and modify them for particular clients:

(1) Counseling activities including career decision-making, goal setting, skills identification.

(2) Information resources including books and vocational interest inventories.
(3) Opportunities to talk with colleagues who now work in other fields.
(4) A research record of successful career changes.
(5) Direct work with a variety of different potential employers.
(6) A network of people to help in the job search.

If there is no money to create a full-fledged program or to use staff and resources in an existing office, institutions can still consider ad-hoc programs. For example, administrators can be encouraged to set up internships for junior faculty members to gain skills which could be useful in both academic and non-academic settings. Senior faculty members in departments could be assigned the responsibility of working with junior colleagues. Career cooperatives of junior faculty members could join together to share information and advice. Many colleges and universities have continuing education programs for training business and industry executives. By getting involved in teaching in these programs, junior faculty members can gather information and make crucial contacts with potential employers.

The national organizations representing the disciplines, such as the Modern Languages Association (MLA) or the American Historical Association (AHA) are also seeking alternative careers for PhDs. The AHA has developed a National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, which assists historians in finding non-academic work, and works to persuade the public of the need for historians in a wide range of positions. Other disciplines should be encouraged to begin and/or continue these kinds of activities.

Professional associations, such as AAHE, can also develop helpful programs. The presentation on Careers in Administration at the 1979 National Conference follows the model of a "career exploration" program used in undegraduate institutions.

Finally, a system can develop answers. The Pennsylvania State Colleges Educational Services Trust Fund has developed a program to counsel and prepare faculty at all levels for non-academic jobs.

Some Thoughts for the Future

There are a variety of ways to begin to deal with the career counseling needs of junior faculty members. It would be both ironic and short-sighted for educational institutions to fail to develop the types of educational programs needed. After all, the problems facing junior faculty members are serious educational problems, not personal stigmas. Moreover, the problems are not new or unique. As most of us know, according to the US Department of Labor the average adult worker changes careers three to five times in her or his lifetime. This crisis has come home. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as many as 40 percent of those earning PhDs from 1976 to 1985 might need to seek jobs not traditionally held by PhDs. In the arts and humanities, education, and business and commerce the oversupply could exceed 60 percent.[1] Recognizing the situation for what it is and discussing the problems openly and honestly is an important first step to developing the necessary support systems. Or, in the words of a recent article in the *AAHE Bulletin*, "First, the issue of career counseling needs to be 'safe' to talk about among the faculty."[2]

Footnotes

[1]James, J. Krolik, "PhDs Moving Into a Nonacademic Setting," *Journal of College Placement*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2 (Winter 1979).
[2]Penelope Garner, "Taking Charge on Campus," *AAHE Bulletin*, Vol. 31, No. 7 (March 1979).

Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning Under Changing Conditions?

By Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Solder and Nina Verroca[1]

During the decade of the 1970s there are few in academe who have not become acquainted with the "Litany of Limits." The precipitous decline in birth rates in the 1960s will cause a significant drop in the number of potential college-going youth in the 1980s; decreased enrollment, in turn, means less income from tuition and state subsidies based on full-time enrollments. Budgets are analyzed and reanalyzed, services questioned, and programs challenged; some persons have come to question the value of postsecondary education unless a specific job awaits the diploma or degree recipient. For academe, Gumperson's Law is everywhere operative: "The probability of anything happening is in inverse relation to its desirability."

In light of these depressing conditions, how do we maintain a sense of vitality, inventiveness, and vision when external pressures are forcing us toward retrenchment and retreat? Since faculty are the basic resource of any academic institution, one creative approach to revitalization is the "faculty growth contract."

What Is a Faculty Growth Contract?

Essentially, the growth contract attempts to identify the strengths and weaknesses of an individual in such a way as to encourage efforts in response to individual, departmental and institutional needs. The growth contract enables the dean or department chairperson to identify the capabilities of faculty within the unit, determine what resources are needed to support them and create a climate of mutual reinforcement. The process involves working out some understanding of where an individual most effectively works within the institutional unit. The interview or discussion begins by assessing strengths and weaknesses of the individual, reaches some understanding of the contribution he or she can make to the needs of the department or institution, develops a specific statement of goals and plans for improvement and professional growth, and concludes with proposals for evaluating the contribution made by the individual. The result is a written statement, a "contract" that becomes a part of the departmental or institutional file.

The process followed by Gordon College, where the growth contract probably has been most fully developed, is much more elaborate than this brief statement suggests. There are nine separate steps, beginning with the individual developing a profile on the basis of self-assessment, including a review of current roles and establishment of long-range goals. The second step is a conference between the individual and unit head. That is followed by a draft of an individual development plan, which includes goals, means of accomplishment, needs, and institutional support. The fourth step is the submission of the profile and annual plan to a faculty development committee. Following a review of the comments by the committee, the individual prepares a final draft of an annual plan. This plan is submitted to the faculty development committee, which makes recommendations regarding support services. The seventh step is the actual carrying out of the plan. This is followed by a combined self-assessment and assessment on the part of the advisory committee. The final step is submission of a report to the faculty development committee, which reviews the accomplishments and makes a summary report to the dean.*

A key concept is that the individual development program is related to institutional needs and goals. The individual plan provides the person who draws up the plan an opportunity to define and pursue the activities which he/she considers important to professional development and to identify the resources needed to accomplish certain objectives. At the same time, the plan allows the institution to identify staff strengths and weaknesses in terms of long-range institutional needs. A critical ingredient is the effort to develop an effective mesh between individual plans and institutional goals. The intent is to make maximum use of individual strengths in the pursuit of long-range institutional goals.

Some aspects of this plan are similar to the business world's strategy of management by objectives, in that there is an identification of goals, an agreement between individual and supervisor on the steps to be taken to meet those goals, and an effort to render accountability through some form of evaluation at the end of the process. Yet the faculty growth contract ought not to be considered simply an academic variation of management by objectives. The emphasis in the faculty growth contract is more on providing a mutually supportive environment than upon strict accountability for results.

The context within which the faculty growth contract has evolved has been the broader activity referred to as "faculty development"—in the sense that Mervin Freedman used the term in *New Directions for Higher Education*. Freedman refers to the intent of faculty development as providing faculty with "heightened understanding of themselves and their social and organizational situation" which "will enable faculty members to assume their rightful place as educational leaders on their

*In assessing its own program, Gordon College notes that while it has found these particular steps important in the development of the individualized plans, it is not suggesting that a faculty growth contract must follow the same precise structure.[2]

own campuses, as well as on the national scene."[3] Subsequently, in an essay by Freedman and Sanford, there is the statement, "By development we mean favorable change whose consequence is that faculty members operate with increasing autonomy in accord with internalized values and goals—and function more effectively as individuals and as members of society. Greater understanding of themselves and of their social surroundings can promote such development."[4] In this sense, faculty development intends to relate the individual to the context within which he or she must work, the environment of academe.

The faculty growth contract ideally looks to the faculty member "not only as a developing individual, but as an integral part of the college community. This means that each person has a responsibility to share his talents with others in the community, and it gives each person the opportunity to tap the knowledge, experience, wisdom, and fellowship of the entire faculty and use it to his advantage. Thus, individual development contributes directly to the development of a rich community which, in turn, contributes to individual development."[5]

To what extent has the faculty growth contract been adopted by institutions? While a number of institutions have expressed interest in the contract, relatively few have implemented the idea as extensively as Gordon. Gordon College sponsored a workshop in June 1977 and attracted some fifty institutions that indicated an initial interest. Some twenty of the institutions have subsequently undertaken to develop pilot contract programs. Phone calls to several of these suggest that the degree of development varies greatly, from "still thinking about the project" to attempting to install the program. Gordon College itself was the subject of one dissertation, and another is underway at the University of Michigan.

A Preliminary Inquiry

Basically, the growth contract seems to be a rational approach to coping effectively with concerns relating to academic jobs and careers in an age of limits.

If this is so, why is the growth contract not more widely applied? Are there any particular barriers or problems that might limit its applicability? Within this context, two graduate students at the University of Denver and I examined the viability of the faculty growth contract as a planning strategy. At the outset, it seemed useful to identify certain basic assumptions involved in the concept of the growth contract and to test the acceptance of these assumptions by undertaking a pilot study at one complex institution. We asked ourselves what we were assuming about the institution, about faculty, and about faculty-institutional relations. Are some of these assumptions more compatible with life in academe than others? If some of the assumptions are incompatible, or even strongly opposed, are there ways to change the environment to make it more accepting of the growth contract? Gordon College had already begun to identify some of these problems under the rubric, "Questions Still Looking for Answers."[6]

After we had identified five assumptions, we turned the assumptions into hypotheses and went to faculty members, department and division heads and deans within a complex university. We wanted to find out if the concept was acceptable and/or desirable in an institution that had not adopted, and for the most part was not aware of, faculty growth contracts. We interviewed 35 persons in two colleges, a college of arts and sciences and a college of business administration. The interviews lasted from 45 minutes to an hour. The results of our "study" are by no means definitive and are limited to the particular institution in which the study was placed. But we believe that we have identified some points that are important considerations for any institution that seeks to implement faculty growth contracts. We have also found out a number of things that could provide the basis for more systematic study in the future.

Assumption #1—*Individual members of a department (or other academic unit) have different talents, expertise, and potential for contributing to the effectiveness of a department and to the college or university as a whole.*

This is much more than an assumption. It is a basic principle upon which departments and other units appoint and retain faculty. It is perhaps an obvious principle, but it needs to be stated because it stands at the beginning of any discussion of the faculty growth contract. The faculty growth contract is an individualized plan, and the assumption is that individuals are sufficiently different that individual planning is necessary.

We were of the opinion that this particular assumption was unlikely to be challenged, because even if a department does not have clearly formulated goals, it operates in informal ways as if the principle were being applied. And all departments, whether large or small, accept the assumption that they must provide breadth and depth in the particular discipline with which they are identified.

While persons in the departments interviewed varied considerably in the preciseness with which they were able to identify their particular goals or longer-range objectives, they all agreed that the department is shaped by the individual strengths and weaknesses of faculty and that it is best to attempt to complement and supplement talents and viewpoints during the appointment and retention process.

In short, the first assumption was universally accepted, even if all the implications were not clearly identified.

Assumption #2—*The effectiveness of the department (institutional unit) can be maintained (enhanced/improved) if the talents of individual members can be emphasized and diversity of assignments maintained.*

This assumption follows the first one. If a department is built upon the principle that its strength depends on the maintenance of a variety of individual strengths, it would seem to follow that some systematic effort should be undertaken to foster the development of individual talents and to maintain a diversity of individual assignments. This is actually two assumptions. The first assumption emphasizes the need to recognize individual talents. The second is that this recognition can be achieved best through differentiation of assignments. We expected to find that department heads and/or individual members of the department would generally accept the proposi-

tion that the department is strengthened when individual talents can be emphasized and, in the proper sense, exploited. We also expected that there would be some resistance to the second part, namely that the way to emphasize individual talents is through providing different assignments for individuals.

We found general agreement that a department or unit benefits by the "exploitation" of individual talent. But the idea that the best way of exploiting talent was through differentiation of assignments was almost universally rejected. At the dean's level, in one case, the response was that all faculty members normally are expected to have the same work loads. According to this viewpoint, within each department there is some degree of flexibility for varying assignments according to the needs and talents of individual members in research, publication, community service, and curriculum development. But realistically, there cannot be significant variation within departments; every faculty member has a full range of responsibilities. Another opinion was that departments have considerable freedom in assigning faculty resources for most efficient operation within the department, and the idea of differentiated assignments is a useful one. But further questioning determined that differentiation of assignments might more appropriately apply to persons who are *well beyond* the tenure stage. In other words, for a person who has not yet received tenure, to neglect any aspect of teaching and research requirements would be detrimental. For the person who has tenure, who has already made scholarly contributions, assignment to different kinds of responsibilities might not only be appropriate but valuable.

While it is acknowledged that the strength of departments depends upon utilization of individual strengths, few persons are prepared to see any significant differentiation of assignments or work activities.

Department chairpersons, with few exceptions, neither accepted the general principle of differentiation of work load nor advocated it for their own departments. With a degree of monotonous regularity, the formula of research, teaching and some public service was noted as the responsibility of *all* faculty within departments. Upon further inquiry, those department chairpersons who seemed sympathetic to the idea tended to set certain conditions under which differentiated work would be acceptable. While it is true that the department as a whole should be well served, in some instances the department might need to draw more heavily upon individuals who have better skills than others. Yet every department chairperson said that research and writing are primary responsibilities in a university, that research and teaching are not in opposition, and while there might be slight variations in the work expectations for faculty within large departments, *all members* were expected to make some contributions in research, writing, and teaching. If, however, a faculty member secured significant research funds, adjustments could be made to allow the individual to concentrate heavily upon research. Where special grants for special projects were available, the work load could be adjusted to allow the individual to pursue that particular professional activity.

In general, department chairpersons seemed to be inclined toward less flexibility than were the deans, although neither group was prepared to make any significant adjustments in individual assignments. If there was any broader acceptance of the idea, it seemed more often to be found among departments in the college of business than in the college of arts and sciences. But the differences between the two colleges were not great.

Faculty members described the situation much the same way as did department chairpersons; the expectation is that every faculty member engage in research, writing, and teaching, with, in some instances public-service commitments. Faculty were, however, more sympathetic to the idea of differentiated assignments. Some observed that differentiation already occurred, but it was generally in the direction of encouraging research and writing or in acknowledging the demands of a research grant or project. While it is dangerous to generalize, it does appear on the basis of faculty responses in these areas that persons within the social sciences were somewhat more inclined toward developing differentiated assignments and were more sympathetic to the idea of allowing faculty to emphasize special interests.

The net result of the inquiries was that while it is acknowleged that the strength of departments depends upon utilization of individual strengths, few persons are prepared to see any significant differentiation of assignments or work activities.

In assessing its own program, Gordon College reports that while the idea of individualizing the role of different faculty members is a critical part of the growth-contract concept, there was "little current evidence that this program has brought about significant new strides toward the ideal of individualizing faculty roles."[7] The report goes on to observe that one of the reasons for lack of individualization may be the relatively short time during which the program has been in operation. But the report is candid enough to note that there may be more substantial reasons. Arguing from the position of the small college, it notes that "any radical reduction of a given faculty member's responsibility in a given area assumes there is someone else with a complementary interest and strength to pick up the slack, which may be a questionable assumption at a small college with many two- or three-person departments." But perhaps even more significant is the idea that individualizing roles and assignments "runs counter to traditional and academic reward systems," and "most academic reward systems are rather unforgiving of weakness." The report goes on to suggest that it may be necessary to accept the proposition that faculty members must be "all-around" persons, that significant differences in assignments may not be realistic in a small college. But, "if this is the case we must admit the limitation it places on the ideal of individualizing faculty roles on the basis of particular strengths."

The implication is that a larger and more complex insti-

tution would have greater opportunity for individualizing roles, since within a large department there should be persons to pick up assignments that are not undertaken by others. Yet, the large and complex institution appears to be even more adamant in opposing differentiation of roles.

Does such resistance limit the applicability of the growth contract? We believe that it does. At least it limits the extent to which individual strengths and weaknesses may be dealt with. It appears that only if the contract is to provide the basis for an individual to improve in the area of research, to develop some research projects, or even to develop some projects related to the improvement of teaching, will the institution be sympathetic to a proposal. But in being sympathetic to the proposal, the institution is unlikely to reduce emphasis on other aspects of the individuals' work. Any differentiation that would reduce emphasis upon research and writing in a complex institution is unlikely to be greeted with any enthusiasm. Yet we know that faculty members do not uniformly undertake research and do not publish regularly; as the Lipset and Ladd studies note, only a small proportion of the faculty actually engage in continuing research.[8]

The academy has been able to live with a good many contradictions, and apparently it is prepared to live with this particular one. Yet the heart of the faculty growth contract is differentiation of assignment, and the effectiveness of a faculty growth contract is limited by the extent to which differentiation of assignment is negated. In implementing faculty growth contracts, it is necessary to face squarely the problem that is involved in gaining acceptance of differentiated assignments. It is necessary to create a climate in which it is possible, for example, for a person to emphasize undergraduate teaching and not to be expected to make contributions in other areas; to recognize important contributions in advising and working with student groups; or to recognize the preponderance of research over lower-division teaching. Yet, ironically, it is the academic who, in the final analysis, probably is most resistant to differentiated assignments. The implicit value system is such that we have developed a tradition of thinking about certain activities as more "scholarly" and more "valuable" than others. And we may not be prepared to accept a procedure that says we are not all similarly prepared for the multiple tasks of significant research, significant teaching, and significant advising. To be a member of the academic community is to be expected to perform effectively in all areas; to expect anything less is unworthy of the academic profession.

Assumption #3—*In a period of limited and often decreasing fiscal resources, under threat of retrenchment, departments can more effectively meet the challenge by more systematic planning for college and institutional needs.*

In calling for systematic analysis of individual strengths and weaknesses and department or college needs, the growth contract requires that academic units address these concerns over a period of time, at least a 3- to 5-year span. Only in such a context is it possible to deal with any significant variations that might occur in faculty requests and institutional responses. Even if widely differentiated assignments are unacceptable, if an individual is to undertake a particular research project, take special leave, or undertake a teaching improvement program, some adjustments will be necessary within the departmental routine. Some tvpe of 3- to 5-year plan provides a more effective basis for deciding on the disposition of individual cases.

We hypothesized that the smaller, single-purpose institutions would more likely have an institution-wide orientation and the departments would be more likely to build programs in response to institution-wide goals and objectives. On the other hand, in the more complex research-oriented institutions, we thought the emphasis would be on the discipline and professional status of individual faculty members, and less emphasis would be placed upon departmental planning. More systematic departmental planning might even be seen as an effort to impose institutional "standards" on what more properly should be viewed as an entrepreneurial relationship, where the department provides a context within which the individual does his or her work, but little effort is made by the department to direct those efforts.

However, we thought that under the pressure of fiscal constraints and the threat of reduction in the available resources, departments might be more amenable to longer-range planning. The pressure to reduce expenditures by modifying personnel policies relating to appointment, promotion, and tenure could force departments into more systematic approaches and sharply reduced activities.

What did we find? At the dean's level, in one instance, there was general support for the concept of long-range planning. As a matter of fact, one college had been engaged in a series of meetings relating to five-year strategic planning for the college as a whole. One of the consequences of this approach was the realization that the individual departments needed to develop plans that would relate to the overall college plan. In another college, however, the concept elicited little response, beyond the general observation that effective departments would command more resources than "unsuccessful" departments.

At the departmental level there was considerable variation in opinion, even within the college that had been engaged in development of the five-year strategic plan. In one department, the head of the department indicated that he "brainstormed" with members of the department to develop objectives for the department as a whole, and the department appeared to be moving toward developing a formal plan for its work. This department earlier had indicated that while there was no general differentiation in assignments among faculty, the head of the department was strongly in favor of using faculty resources more efficiently and implied that some form of differentiation might be acceptable.

Other departments in the college engaged in five-year strategic planning were less specific about what they did. One department head referred to a democratic departmental assignment of courses, where yearly plans are made between the chairperson and the individual faculty members. The emphasis, however, was on course assignments rather than on more comprehensive departmental planning.

At the college which placed emphasis on the depart-

ments determining their own destinies, at the departmental-chair level only one of the departments admitted to formulating a 3-to-5-year plan. And even this so-called plan was at a fairly informal level in that the person interviewed stressed that highest priority must be placed upon the individual's development and that any plan must be flexible enough to take into consideration individual needs. In the other departments the chairpersons did not identify any particular long-range departmental plan. There were discussions about certain curricular changes, but planning in the sense of setting long-range objectives, assessing resources, and setting priorities did not appear to exist. Two of the departments were of the opinion that the dean of the college had a long-range plan in mind, but that departmental planning had not progressed to any great extent. On further inquiry, the "long-range plan" appeared to revolve around the dean's concern for earning the college a stronger national reputation. Little in the way of specifics was noted.

Most of the department heads were content to meet situations as they occurred rather than plan in the formal sense.

At the faculty level, the one department that had identified long-range planning as a significant factor was the one in which faculty members perceived the beginning of a formal planning process in the setting of individual and overall departmental objectives. On the other hand, some of the same faculty members were concerned that fiscal limitations might preclude any significant long-range planning, that the department might simply have to respond to crisis situations.

In another department in the same college, faculty members saw long-range planning as a variation of management by objectives. Such an approach could be detrimental rather than helpful, they said, in that faculty members could be held to certain performance criteria that were not significantly related to important scholarly activities. In another department annual two-day retreats were employed to work out plans for the year.

In the college where the departments maintained considerable autonomy, most of the faculty reported that some planning was underway, but under further inquiry it appeared that this planning was simply discussion of departmental meetings or annual decisions on course assignments. Most faculty observed, however, that departments were placing more emphasis on the need for more careful analysis of promotion and tenure recommendations.

Overall, our impression was that most of the department heads were content to meet situations as they occurred rather than plan in the formal sense. Some faculty members resisted the idea of any formal planning as incompatible with a sound academic environment. They held that the role of the department is to provide opportunities for the faculty member to develop within the discipline, and not to set goals and to "program" individual performance. Concern was expressed that more formal planning would place greater restrictions upon faculty initiative and prove to be an instrument for punishment (in the sense of withholding rewards) rather than encouraging initiative and development.

Another undercurrent that we sensed in the course of the interviews was the suspicion that more systematic planning would demand a great deal of time and that departments simply were not sufficiently organized nor did they have the resources necessary for such planning efforts. Installing a faculty growth contract which demanded that every faculty member be interviewed, every plan be reviewed, and final assignments be negotiated, could be a long and involved process.

It *is* time consuming, at least in the initial stage, to go through the process of individual interviews, draw up, review, and revise plans, and assess proposals in terms of departmental and institutional goals. While there is much talk of planning, and while there may be planning at the president's or dean's level, particularly with regard to budgeting, there is relatively little systematic planning going on at the departmental level. Departments simply present their requirements and argue over the funds allocated, but finally adjust to the funds available and reduce expenditures for supplies, travel, and instructional support—probably in that sequence.

Up to this point in the interviews we had not referred to the growth contract as such. Now we described the growth contract in specific terms. As we identified the characteristics of the contract, we found general acceptance of the idea as being worthy of consideration. However, almost every respondent raised certain objections. One department head said it sounded like so much "educationalist jargon," and that it was just another form of management by objectives, which had already proved not particularly effective. Faculty members within this particular college suggested that the idea was "philosophically worthwhile and acceptable," but that it was likely to add to bureaucratic procedures and stifle individual creativity.

In another department the concept was viewed as worthwhile and probably workable with most faculty members, but the department head was not enthusiastic about pursuing the matter more systematically. He said that the idea of growth contracts was already operative in the sense that departments could adjust to individual concerns and needs. Another department chair was adamantly opposed to the concept because he held that it involved too much work for the chairman and the faculty would not benefit from differentiated assignments; indeed, more problems than advantages would be created. One faculty member suggested that the growth contract was only a wedge to replace the tenure system.

Assumption #4—*The reward system within the department/institution can be adjusted to take into account differential assignments, and such an adjustment should be made.*

If any differentiation is to be made in assignments for individual faculty members and is to fit within department-wide planning, then it would seem to follow that the reward system will have to be adjusted to take these differentiated requirements into account. We assumed

that single-purpose institutions might be more amenable to adjusting their reward systems. On the other hand, we expected to find the complex university much less willing to make such distinctions. Promotion and tenure would be based upon research and publication, the only qualifier being the type of research and publication. Individuals might be able to effect differentiation in assignment by virtue of securing research grants and would not suffer in the reward system. Teaching assignments might also be reduced to allow the principle investigator to devote more time to research, but it would be unlikely that a person would be excused from research to take on larger teaching responsibilities.

Experiences at Gordon College suggest that even the smaller institution is less amenable to variations in the reward system than we might have expected. The Report refers to the fact that "most academic reward systems are rather unforgiving of weakness." At Gordon, securing promotion or tenure requires evidence of merit in at least two of the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship and institutional usefulness or service.[9] While it shows some flexibility, Gordon is saying that the traditional requirements for salary increases, promotion and tenure continue to obtain.

In interviews at the complex institution we found not only continuing emphasis upon the traditional reward structure, but an increase in performance demands. Requirements for promotion and tenure were becoming more difficult to meet and the demands for evidence of research and publication were increasing. While the importance of teaching is continually emphasized at all levels (dean, department, faculty member), there is general acceptance of the proposition that the rewards go to those who have distinguished themselves in scholarly activity represented by some form of research in some form of publication, together with reasonably adequate performance in teaching.

This raises another significant concern. An effective faculty growth contract system requires at least the possibility of some adjustment in the reward system. Our findings show that institutions reward faculty for excellence in all three areas of their work—teaching, research, and writing.

Assumption #5—*The faculty growth contract can be applied to all disciplines, all academic units.*

We have no basis for making this assumption beyond our impression that there might be more receptivity to this concept in applied fields, such as education. We decided to test the hypothesis that the basic approach to identifying strengths and weaknesses and specifying goals could relate equally to all disciplines and academic departments.

We found no clear distinction between disciplines or professional fields, although there seemed to be slightly more inclination to accept the idea in the college of business administration than in the college of arts and sciences. Yet there was as much opposition within certain departments of business administration as there was acceptance of the idea in some departments of arts and sciences. In short, without a further analysis and study we are not able to say that the concept is or is not discipline-specific.

We are tempted to say that academe, while placing great emphasis upon rationality, is reluctant to apply rational approaches to the solution of its own problems.

Summary

We found more objection than support for the idea of the faculty growth contract in a complex, research-oriented institution. In "theory" and in terms of "philosophy" the concept was deemed worthy of attention. But departments raised so many objections to differentiated assignments, to more systematic departmental planning, and to proposed changes in the reward system that there seemed to be little genuine acceptance of the concept.

However, if the present fiscal constraints continue, departments may find themselves drifting into a modified form of the growth contract. We also think that more formal planning procedures will be forced on departments, which they will undertake with reluctance; but after the objections and complaints have been made, most departments will settle down to more structured planning.

The concept of the faculty growth contract still seems to be a rational approach to using faculty resources in a way that would assist departments to plan and individuals to develop more effectively. We are tempted to say that academe, while placing great emphasis upon rationality, is reluctant to apply rational approaches to the solution of its own problems. On the other hand, there are some deep and probably legitimate concerns that should not be lightly dismissed. In spite of the many changes that have taken place in academe, the belief that the individual should be unimpeded in his or her efforts to develop approaches to teaching, to undertake research that is appealing, and to be in control of his or her destiny, are deeply embedded in the academic identity. Even though instituting more systematic planning may not be an infringement on academic freedom, any move toward restrictions will be viewed by the academic as restrictive. Academic freedom tends to be defined quite broadly as allowing the academician to be an entrepreneur and to engage in whatever he or she considers appropriate.

The reluctance of the academician to be viewed in other than a special light is touched upon by Jerry Gaff in *Toward Faculty Renewal.* Referring to the fact that business has turned to more systematic planning, employing techniques for setting clear and realistic goals and accepting the principle of management by objectives, Gaff says that academe tends to hold that a college or university is a different kind of organization, and "part of the reason why organizational development has not been extensively used in colleges or universities is that they are quite different in character from business corporations and other organizations where the basic work has been conducted.[10] Like a number of writers, Gaff notes that in a college or university goals are much less specific and

clear cut, dealing with intangibles such as the education of students and advanced knowledge rather than the production of specific goods or products. Yet, while the industrial model may not be directly applicable to organizational planning and development in a college or university, with some modifications the concepts of industrial organizational development may be useful, and in the long run, more systematic development will be demanded of colleges and universities.

The faculty growth contract seems to be an appropriate step toward long-range planning. It ought to be a viable tool for institutional planning, but so far it has had limited application; there are some deep-seated academic principles—or biases—that will need to be modified if the concept is more fully to be adopted.

Footnotes

[1]Allan Pfnister is Professor of Higher Education at the University of Denver.

Jill Solder and Nina Verroca are graduate students enrolled in the PhD program in higher education at the University of Denver. They were responsible for the actual interviewing reported in the paper, but they also joined in shaping the questions, organizing the paper and reviewing and contributing to the drafts. The paper is a joint venture in every respect.

[2]Gordon College, *Handbook: Professional Development Through Growth Contracts* (Wenham, Mass: Gordon College, 1979), pp. 50-52.

[3]Freedman, Mervin, "Editor's Notes," *Facilitating Faculty Development: New Directions for Higher Education*, Number 1, Spring 1973 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973), p. ix.

[4]Freedman, Mervin and Nevitt Sanford, "The Faculty Member Yesterday and Today," *Facilitating Faculty Development*, op. cit., p. 3

[5]Gaff, Jerry G., *Toward Faculty Renewal* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975), p. 107.

[6]Gordon College, *Handbook*, op. cit., pp. 17-22.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 20.

[8]See reports: "Professors' Output of Books and Monographs," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, XV (November 21, 1977), p. 12 and "The Scholarly Articles Published by Professors," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, XV (November 28, 1977), p. 2.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

[10]Gaff, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979

The series of seven monographs may be purchased for $12.50.

(1) **Perspectives on Leadership** $2.00

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe"

Morton Darrow, "Changing Values: Implications for Major Social Institutions"

Michael Maccoby, "Leadership Needs of the 1980s"

(2) **Faculty Career Development** $2.50

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument"

Roger Baldwin, "Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty?"

B. Claude Mathis, "Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research"

Robert T. Blackburn, "Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities"

Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin, "Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview"

Allan O. Pinister, Jill Solder, and Nina Verroca, "Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning Under Changing Conditions?"

(3) **Premises of Federal Student Assistance** $1.50

David W. Breneman, "Introduction"

Kenneth M. Deitch, "Why Strains on Need-Based Financial Aid Are Increasing and Some Options for Relieving Them"

Martin Kramer, "How Good Is the Student Financial Aid System?"

Marshall S. Smith, "Premises of Student Assistance: It Isn't Time for a New Look"

(4) **Employment Priorities in Academe** $2.00

Robert H. Linnell, "Age, Sex, and Ethnic Trade-Offs in Faculty Employment: You Can't Have Your Cake and Eat It Too"

Bernice Resnick Sandler, "You've Come a Long Way, Maybe—Or Why It Still Hurts To Be a Woman in Labor"

Frank Newman, "Can There Be Anything Affirmative About Affirmative Action in the 1980s?"

(5) **Assessment** $2.50

David G. Winter, "Defining and Measuring the Competencies of a Liberal Arts Education"

Alice J. Irby, "Statewide Assessment of Basic Skills"

Thomas R. Plough, "Identifying and Evaluating Major Elements in the Quality of Student Life"

Edward A. Dougherty, "What Is the Most Effective Way To Handle Program Discontinuance?"

John Harris, "How Do You Know a Good College When You Stumble Over One?"

(6) **Tenure** $2.00

Walter P. Metzger, "The History of Tenure"
James O'Toole, "The Poverty of Historicism: A Critique of Walter Metzger's Defense of Tenure"

Penina M. Glazer, "The Concept of Tenure and an Alternative"

(7) **PhDs in Nonacademic Careers: Are There Good Jobs?** $2.00 (2 papers)
Lewis C. Solmon

Robots or Reinsmen: Job Opportunities and Professional Standing for Collegiate Administrators in the 1980s
Robert A. Scott

Order Form

____ copies of (1)
____ copies of (2)
____ copies of (3)
____ copies of (4)
____ copies of (5)
____ copies of (6)
____ copies of (7)
____ copies of the entire series

Name _____
Address _____
_____
_____

I enclose $_____ (payable to AAHE).

Payment must accompany all orders. Orders of less than four papers must be accompanied by a $1.00 special-handling fee. Please make check payable to AAHE. Send order to: Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036.